

Volume XXXIV

APRIL, 1919

APR - 7 1919  
Number 4

UNIV. OF MICH.

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

EDITED BY

JAMES WILSON BRIGHT, Editor-in-Chief

MURRAY PEABODY BRUSH

GUSTAV GRUENBAUM

WILLIAM KURRELMEYER

## CONTENTS

MUSTARD, W. P.—E. K.'s Classical Allusions,	193
WOOD, FRANCIS A.—Germanic Etymologies,	203
WOODBIDGE, BENJ. M.—Two Foster Brothers of D'Artagnan,	208
GRAY, HENRY DAVID.—'Titus Andronicus' Once More,	214
NICHOLS, CHARLES W.—Fielding Notes,	220

### Reviews:—

DANIEL FREDERICK PASMORE, <i>Karl Gutzkow's Short Stories. A Study in the Technique of Narration.</i> [F. Schoenemann.]	224
GERARD EDWARD JENSEN, <i>The Covent-Garden Journal.</i> By Sir Alexander Druccansir (Henry Fielding);	
JAMES T. HILLHOUSE, <i>The Tragedy of Tragedies.</i> By Henry Fielding;	
WILBUR L. CROSS, <i>The History of Henry Fielding.</i> [Samuel C. Chew.]	235
W. J. SEDGEFIELD, <i>The Place-Names of Cumberland and Westmorland.</i> [George T. Flom.]	239

### Correspondence:—

ALDEN, RAYMOND M.— <i>Titus Andronicus</i> and Shakespeare Dogmatics,	244
BROOKE, TUCKER.— <i>Titus Andronicus</i> ,	246
GRAY, H. D.—Postscript,	247
D'EVELYN, CHARLOTTE.— <i>Piers Plowman</i> in Art,	247
SCOGGIN, G. C.— <i>Longaevus Error Typographicus</i> ,	249

### Brief Mention:—

ROBERT SHAFER, <i>The English Ode to 1660: An Essay in Literary History</i> ;	
RAY P. BOWEN, <i>Life and Novels of Ferdinand Fabre</i> ;	
MARCEL MORAUD, <i>Sous Les Armes</i> ,	250

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS  
BALTIMORE

Eight Numbers a Year—Single Copy (Current) Forty Cents

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103,  
Act of October 3, 1917. Authorized on July 2, 1918

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

**A MONTHLY PUBLICATION with inter-  
mission from July to October (inclusive)**

This publication is devoted to linguistic and literary research and to æsthetic and philosophic criticism in the domain of English, German, and the related Germanic Languages; and of French, Italian, Spanish, and the other Languages of the Romance Group. Its purpose is also to promote sound methods in the teaching of the Modern Languages and Literatures

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is  
\$3.00 for the United States and Mexico; Canada \$3.25  
and \$3.50 for other countries included in the Postal Union.

Contributors and Publishers will please address matter for the English Department of the *Notes* to James W. Bright; for the German Department to William Kurrelmeyer; for the French, Italian, and Spanish Departments to Murray P. Bruah. Other matter may be sent to the Editor-in-Chief. The address of all the editors is Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to the Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Md.

## PREPARATION OF COPY

All copy should be in typewritten form.

Underscore (for italics) all titles of books, periodicals, poems, plays and other separately published compositions.

Use numerals in designating foot-notes, and number foot-notes in unbroken sequence.

Use roman numerals for volume-reference, set off by a comma before a following page-reference.

## OXFORD FRENCH SERIES

By American Scholars

General Editor: Raymond Weeks, Ph. D.

Just Issued

## LA CHANÇUN DE WILLAME

An Edition of the Unique Manuscript of the Poem with  
Vocabulary and a Table of Proper Nouns

Edited by ELIZABETH STEARNS TYLER, M. A., Ph. D.

Crown 8vo (7¼ x 5), Introduction i-xvii, Text 1-146, Table of Assonance 149-150, Vocabulary 153-160, Proper Nouns 165-173. 90c.

This edition of the *Chançon de Willame* will be welcomed by folk-lorists, by historians seeking a picture of the Middle Ages, and by literary amateurs seeking beautiful poetry. It is a storehouse for anyone interested in the history or literature of medieval France.

### Le Tartuffe ou L'Imposteur

Comédie, edited with introduction and notes by BERT EDWARD YOUNG, Professor of Romance Languages, Vanderbilt University. Introduction pp. lxxxv, Preface pp. xcii, Text pp. 114, Notes pp. 117-172. \$1.00.



## OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

A M E R I C A N B R A N C H

THIRTY-FIVE W. THIRTY-SECOND ST., NEW YORK



# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOLUME XXXIV

APRIL, 1919

NUMBER 4

## E.K.'S CLASSICAL ALLUSIONS

### *The Epistle to Gabriel Harvey:*

The striking simile,

In whom whenas this our Poet hath bene much traueiled and  
thoroughly redd, how could it be, (as that worthy Oratour sayde)  
but that walking in the sonne, although for other cause he walked,  
yet needes he mought be sunburnt,

comes from Cicero. The 'worthy Oratour' is Antonius, in *De Oratore*, ii, 14, 60,

ut, cum in sole ambulem, etiam si ego aliam ob causam ambulem,  
feri natura tamen ut colorer, sic cum istos libros . . . studiosius  
legerim, sentio illorum tactu orationem meam quasi colorari.

In *Mod. Lang. Notes*, xxiv, 30-31, a contributor discusses the passage,

For, if my memory fayle not, Tullie, in that book wherein he  
endeuoureth to set forth the paterne of a perfect Oratour, sayth  
that oftentimes an auncient worde maketh the style seeme graue,  
and as it were reuerend: no otherwise then we honour and reuer-  
ence gray heares, for a certein religious regard, which we haue  
of old age.

This, he says, undoubtedly refers to Cicero, *De Oratore*, iii, 38.  
Perhaps it refers rather to Cicero's *Orator*, 50, 169,

Habet autem ut in aetatibus auctoritatem senectus, sic in exem-  
plis antiquitas, quae quidem apud me ipsum valet plurimum.

On the passage,

For albe amongst many other faultes it specially be obiected of  
Valla against Liuius, and of other against Salustius, that with ouer  
much studie they affect antiquitie, etc.,

Professor G. Gregory Smith says, "See Valla's *Emendationes in Livium de bello Punico*, in the Paris edition of Livy, 1573" (*Elizabethan Critical Essays*, i, 381). He refers also to Roger Ascham's criticism of Sallust, in his treatise *Of Imitation*.

"So great delight tooke the worthy Poete Alceus to behold a blemish in the ioynt of a wel shaped body." Cicero, *Nat. Deor.* i, 28, 79, "Naevus in articulo pueri delectat Alcaeum."

"If they happen to here an olde word albeit very naturall and significant, crye out streight way, that we speak no English, but gibbrish, or rather such, as in old time Euanders mother spake." Cp. Aulus Gellius, *N. A.* i, 10, 2, "tu autem proinde quasi cum matre Evandri nunc loquare, sermone abhinc multis annis iam desito uteris."

"Or as that same Pythia, when the traunce came upon her, Os rabidum fera corda domans &c." A loose quotation from Virgil, *Aen.* vi, 80.

In *Mod. Lang. Notes*, xxiv, 10, I suggested that the passage,

following the example of the best and most auncient Poetes, which deuised this kind of wryting, being both so base for the matter, and homely for the manner, at the first to trye theyr habilities; and as young birdes, that be newly crept out of the nest, by little first to proue theyr tender wyngs, before they make a greater flyght. . . . So flew Virgile, as not yet well feeling his winges, etc.,

should be compared with the 'Prologue' to the *Egloges* of Alexander Barclay,

Therefore wise Poetes, to sharpe and proue their wit,  
In homely iestes wrote many a merry fit,  
Before they durst be of audacitie  
Taunture thinges of weyght and grauitie. . . .  
The birde unused first flying from her nest  
Dare not aduventure, and is not holde nor prest  
With winges abroade to flye as doth the olde, etc.

There is an earlier expression of the same fancy in Poliziano's discourse on Virgil, *Manto*, 202-213 (1482),

Namque meus timido qui rura et pascua versu  
Hactenus excoluit, stimulis tandem acribus actus  
Dediscetque metum validasque in pectora vires  
Contrahe't, attonitoque canet fera pectine bella.  
Qualis adhuc brevibus quae vix bene fidere pinnis  
Coepit avis, matrem primo nidosque loquaces



Circumit et crebrum patula super arbore sidit;  
 Colligit inde animos sensim, et vicina volatu  
 Stagna legit, terrasque capit captasque relinquit,  
 Lascivitque fuga; tandem et sublimia tranat  
 Nubila, et iratis audens se credere ventis  
 In spatia excurrit, iustisque eremigat alis.

*The General Argument:*

On E.K.'S etymology of the word 'Aeglogues,'

They were first of the Greekes, the inuentours of them called *Aeglogai*, as it were *αἰγῶν*, or *αἰγονόμων λόγοι*, that is, Goteheards tales,

Professor Herford says, "This notion, first enounced by Petrarch (Warton)," etc. But the notion is probably much earlier than Petrarch. And something of the sort is enounced in an ancient Life of Virgil which is preserved in a manuscript of the 9th century (*Vita Gudianæ* II):

*Egogla* dicitur quasi *egaloga*, quia *ega* dicitur capra, *logos* sermo. Inde *egogla* dicitur sermo de capris.

"For although in Virgile and others the speakers be more shepheards then Goteheards, yet Theocritus . . . maketh Goteheards the persons and authors of his tales." Not always, even in his strictly bucolic Idyls. He introduces also shepherds, neatherds, and reapers.

"The olde Astrologers and Philosophers, namely the reuerend Andalo, and Macrobius in his holydayes of Saturne." A curious pair. The 'reuerend Andalo' seems to be Andalò di Negro (or Andalone de Negri), Boccaccio's teacher in astronomy. For some account of him, and of his works, see E. H. Wilkins, *MLN.* xxi, 212 ff. As for Macrobius, see *Saturn.* i, 12, 5.

*Eclogue* i, 1. "As sometime did Virgil (shadow himself) under the name of Tityrus." An allusion to Virgil's First Eclogue.

i, 57. "Imitateth Virgils verse, Rusticus es, Corydon, nec munera curat Amyntas." *Ecl.* ii, 56.

i, 59. "Plato in his dialogue called Alcibiades." See Plato, *Alcibiades* i, 131 C. The other allusions in this note may be to such passages as Xenophon, *Symposium*, viii, and Maximus Tyrius, xxi, 8 h. Lucian's "defence of execrable and horrible sinnes of forbidden and unlawful fleshlinesse" might be hard to find.

i, 60. "Ouide shadoweth hys loue under the name of Corynna." Ovid, *Tr.* iv, 10, 60, "nomine non vero dicta Corinna mihi." "So doth Aruntius Stella euery where call his Lady Asteris and Ianthis, albe it is wel knowen that her right name was Violantilla: as witnesseth Statius in his Epithalamium." Aruntius Stella (Consul about 101 A. D.) was a patron and friend of the poets Statius and Martial. Statius wrote a long poem on the occasion of his marriage, 'Epithalamion in Stellam et Violentillam,' *Silvae*, i, 2. Part of E.K.'S statement is based on line 197 of this poem, "Asteris et vatis totam cantata per urbem." The fact that Stella called his lady 'Ianthis' in his poems is recorded by Martial, "vel Stellae cantata meo quas flevit Ianthis" (vii, 14, 5).

ii, 33. "The saying is borrowed of Mimius Publianus." One of the *Sententiae* of Publilius (or Publius) Syrus, a mime-writer of the Cæsarian age.

ii, 63. "The name (*sc.* Phyllis) is usuall in Theocritus, Virgile, and Mantuane." It is 'usuall' in Virgil, but does not occur in Theocritus.

ii, 215. "As Virgile also sayeth: Saxa gemunt grauido &c." This is not in Virgil, or in any of the poems commonly ascribed to him.

iii, 1. The Idyl here ascribed to Theocritus is now ascribed to Bion (no. iv).

iii, 16. "As saith Tacitus." This story of Flora is not given by Tacitus. Perhaps it is derived from Lactantius, *Inst.* i, 20, 6. The name 'Andronica' is not given by our Latin dictionaries.

iii, 17. "As sayth Macrobius." *Saturn.* i, 12, 19 (one of many explanations quoted).

iii, 33. Love with "winges of purple; so is he feyned of the Poetes." Cp. Ovid, *Rem. Am.* 701, "nec nos purpureas pueri resecaimus alas."

iii, 40. "Virgils verse, Est mihi namque domi pater, est iniusta noverca &c." Virgil, *Ecl.* iii, 33.

iii, 79. The elegy of Propertius referred to is iii, 12. "Mosschus his Idyllion of wandring love" is *Idyl* I.

iii, 97. "I remember that in Homer it is sayd of Thetis," etc. This story is not in Homer. It is implied in Statius, *Achill.* i, 134, and told in detail by Servius, on *Aen.* vi, 57. The explanation quoted from Eustathius is hard to find—if 'Eustathius' is the

commentator on Homer. Perhaps it is derived from Fulgentius, *Myth.* iii, 7, "quod venae quae in talo sunt ad renum et femorum et virilium rationem pertineant, unde et aliquae venae usque ad pollicem tendunt. . . . Nam et Orfeus illum esse principalem libidinis indicat locum," etc. The statement of 'Hipocrates' concerning certain veins about the ear may be found in the treatise *De Aere, Aquis et Locis*, xxix (ed. Ermerins).

iv, 26. "Myrto the most excellent Poete Theocritus his dearling." Cp. *Id.* vii, 97, "Simichidas loves Myrto as goats love the spring" (where 'Simichidas' is commonly identified with Theocritus himself). "Himera the worthy Poete Stesichorus hys Idole." Unknown to our classical dictionaries. 'Himera' was a town in Sicily where Stesichorus lived.

iv, 42. E.K. (like Spenser in this passage) makes Helicon "the name of a fountaine at the foote of Parnassus," but adds that it is the name "also of a mounteine in Baeotia, out of which floweth the famous Spring Castalius." To the classical poets Helicon was a mountain range in Boeotia, and the Castalian Spring was at the foot of Mt. Parnassus. Chaucer, Lydgate and Skelton speak of Helicon as a spring or well.

iv, 46. "Hesiodus ἀργυρέον μέλος." Not in Hesiod.

iv, 50. For the story of Syrinx, cp. Ovid, *M.* i, 704-711. The two lines quoted from Homer are *Iliad*, ii, 196-7.

iv, 86. For the story of Niobe, cp. Ovid, *M.* vi, 170 ff.

iv, 100. The verse quoted from Virgil's 'Epigrams,' "Signat cuncta manu, loquiturque Polymnia gestu," comes from a short poem *De Musis*, or *De Musarum Inventis*, which was in the 16th century ascribed to Ausonius. The poem is given in Scaliger's *Catalecta Virgilii etc.*, and in Riese's *Anthologia Latina*, No. 664.

iv, 109. "Homer onely addeth a fourth (s. Pasithea)." In the *Iliad*, xiv, 276, Pasithea is called "one of the younger Graces." The 'Theodontius' who is quoted here must be the 'Theodontius' who is very often quoted as an authority in Boccaccio's *Genealogia deorum gentilium*. He is not, however, mentioned in Boccaccio's chapter on the Graces. "And Boccace saith, that they (sc. the Graces) be painted naked . . . the one hauing her backe towards us, and her face fromwarde, as proceeding from us: the other two toward us, noting double thanke to be due to us for the benefit we haue done." Cp. *Geneal. deor. gentil.* v, 35, "Has . . . dicunt

nudas incedere et inuicem uinctas; ac ex eis duas facie ad nos esse conuersas, cum tergum tertia uertat. Quid autem in hoc senserint veteres excutiendum est. . . . Vel aliter: siquid enim in hominem gratum miseris, ab eo in te duplum seu maius redire videbis," etc.

iv, 122. For the note on 'Chloris,' see Ovid, *F.* v. 197-212.

iv, 124. "When Neptune and Minerva stroue for the naming of the citie of Athens," etc. Servius, on Virgil, *Geor.* i, 12, "Cum Neptunus et Minerva de Athenarum nomine contenderent, placuit diis, ut eius nomine civitas appellaretur, qui munus melius mortalibus obtulisset. Tunc Neptunus percusso litore equum, animal bellis aptum, produxit; Minerva iacta hasta olivam creavit, quae res est melior comprobata et pacis insigne."

iv, Embleme. "This Poesye is taken out of Virgile." *Aen.* i, 327-8.

v, 54. "Eusebius in his fift booke de Preparat. Euang." See ch. 17. "Plutarch, in his booke of the ceasing of oracles." *De defectu Oraculorum*, cap. 17. The "demaund of the Emperoure Tiberius" is part of Plutarch's story.

v, 57. "The comen prouerb, Malim inuidere mihi omnes quam miserescere." Cp. Erasmus, *Adagia*, 1044 B, "Nihil tam vulgari sermone iactatum, quam haec sententia: *Praestat invidiosum esse quam miserabilem.*" Erasmus quotes Pindar, *Pyth.* i, 85, *κρείσσων γὰρ οἰκτιρμοῦ φθόνος*, also Herodotus, iii, 52.

v, 69. "Epitaphe of the ryotous king Sardanapalus . . . thus translated by Tullie, 'Haec habui quae edi, quaeque exaturata libido Hausit, at illa manent multa ac praeclara relicta.'" Cicero, *Tusc. Disp.* v, 35, 101 (where the modern texts have *habeo* instead of *habui*, and *iacent* instead of *manent*).

v, 142. "Atlas . . . who (as the Grekes say) did first fynd out the hidden courses of the starres, by an excellent imagination. Wherefore the poetes feigned, that he susteyned the firmament on hys shoulders." Cp. Servius, on *Aen.* i, 741, "hic quod annum in tempora dividerit et primus stellarum cursus vel circulorum vel siderum transitus naturasque descripserit, caelum dictus est sustinere." E.K. gives a rather confusing blend of two ancient stories, that Atlas was a brother of Prometheus (Hesiod, *Theog.* 507 ff.), and that he was an African king (Servius, *loc. cit.*).

v, 205. "The saying of Andromache to Ascanius in Virgile, Sic oculus, sic ille manus, sic ora ferebat." *Aen.* iii, 490.

v, Embleme. "A peece of Theognis verse." Hard to find in Theognis. Professor C. W. E. Miller gives me a phrase from Pindar, *Frag.* 233 (257), *πιστὸν δ' ἀπίστοις οὐδέν*.

vi, 10. "Diodorus Syculus description of it" (*sc.* Mesopotamia). See, perhaps, xvii, 17, 3 (of the well watered country of the Uxii).

vi, 25. "Musaeus sayth, that in Heroes eyther eye there satte a hundred graces." *De Herone et Leandro*, 65.

vi, 43. "Virgils verse, Ipse ego cana legam tenera lanugine mala." Virgil, *Ecl.* ii, 51.

vi, 68. For the story of Pan, Phoebus and Midas, cp. Ovid, *Met.* xi, 153-179.

vi, 81. "Tullie calleth Lentulus, Deum vitae suae, s. the God of hys lyfe." Cicero, *Post Red. in Senatu*, iv, 8, "P. Lentulus, parens ac deus nostrae vitae."

vii, 12. "Seneca his verse, Decidunt celsa grauiore lapsu." Apparently not in Seneca; perhaps a misquotation of Horace, *Od.* ii, 10, 10, "celsae graviore casu Decidunt turres."

vii, 59. "Diodorus Syc. of the hyl Ida." The passage alluded to is xvii, 7, 6-7. But Spenser was thinking less of Diodorus Siculus and Mt. Ida than of 'good old Mantuan' and his description of the Terrestrial Paradise. The "hyllie place Where Titan ryseth from the mayne" is translated from Mantuan, *Ecl.* viii, 45, "Esse locum memorant, ubi surgit ab aequore Titan," etc. Mantuan reflects a common mediæval tradition (based upon *Ezekiel*, xxviii, 13-16) which placed the Terrestrial Paradise on a lofty mountain in the far East.

vii, 64. "The Shepheard is Endymion." Classical tradition puts the long sleep of Endymion on Mt. Latmus, not on Mt. Ida, and in Spenser's *Epithalamion*, 380, he is called "the Latmian shephard." See Servius, on Virgil, *Geor.* iii, 391.

vii, 85. "Of thone speaketh Mantuane, and of thother Theocritus." 'Melampode' is mentioned by Mantuan, *Ecl.* viii, 17; 'teribinth,' by Theocritus, *Epigr.* i, 6. The quotation from Theocritus is badly mangled, perhaps by the printer.

vii, 146-7. The notes on Helen and Paris follow the usual classical story.

vii, 154. "The transformed Cow Io: So called because that in the print of a Cowes foote, there is figured an I in the midst of



an O." This statement is probably based on a passage of Ovid, *Met.* i, 649, "Littera pro verbis, quam pes in pulvere duxit, Corporis indicium mutati triste peregit," where the old Italian commentator Raphael Regius has, "Bouis enim pes i & o litteras exprimere uidetur" (Venice ed., 1497).

vii, 219. "The poet Aeschylus, that was brayned with a shell-fishe." Valer. Max. ix, 12; Aelian, *De Nat. Animal.* vii, 16; Pliny, *N. H.* x, 3, 7.

viii, 19. "According to Virgile, Infelix o semper ouis pecus." *Ecl.* iii, 3.

viii, 26. "So also do Theocritus and Virgile feigne pledges of their strife." Cp. Theocritus, v, 22-30, Virgil, *Ecl.* iii, 29 ff.

viii, 27. "Such pretie descriptions euerywhere useth Theocritus to bring in his Idyllia." Cp. *Id.* i, 31 ff.; also Moschus, *Id.* ii, 43-62.

viii, 131. "So saith Virgile, Et vitula tu dignus, et hic &c." *Ecl.* iii, 109.

ix, 54. "Imitating Horace, Debes ludibrium ventis." A loose quotation from *Od.* i, 14, 15-16, "nisi ventis Debes ludibrium."

ix, 76. "Translated out of Mantuane." *Ecl.* vi, 8-9, "sperata videntur Magna, velut maius reddit distantia lumen."

ix, 240. "Ouids verse translated, Quod caret alterna requie, durable non est." Ovid, *Her.* iv, 89.

ix, Embleme. "This is the saying of Narcissus in Ouid." *Met.* iii, 466.

x, 1. "This Aeglogue is made in imitation of Theocritus his xvi. Idilion. . . . And the lyke also is in Mantuane." The reference to Theocritus is right. As for Mantuan, see *Ecl.* v.

x, 21. "Plato, who in his first booke de Legibus sayth," etc. This confused statement about "the solemne feastes called Panegyrica," with the distinction between the terms 'vates' and 'poet,' is not in Plato's "first booke de Legibus." It might be hard to find anywhere.

x, 27. "That memorable history of Alexander: to whom when as Timotheus the great Musitian playd the Phrygian melodie," etc. The exact story is hard to find. Dion Chrysostom, *Or.* i, 1, tells of a flute-player Timotheos playing before Alexander, and Plutarch has a similar story about Alexander and the musician Antigenidas (*De Alex. s. virt. s. fort.*, ii, 2). The famous Timotheus is said

to have died the year before Alexander was born. "Wherefore Plato and Aristotle forbid the Arabian Melodie from children and youth," etc. This also might be hard to find.

x, 28. "Orpheus . . . recovered his wife Eurydice from hell." Virgil and Ovid tell only of "his half regained Eurydice." 'E. K.' seems to accept Spenser's unusual version, "did fetch . . . withouten leaue," etc.

x, 32. For the story of Argus, cp. Ovid, *Met.* i, 623-722.

x, 55. "The Romish Tityrus, wel known to be Virgile." Spenser is paraphrasing Mantuan here, *Ecl.* v, 86, "Tityrus (ut fama est) sub Maecenate vetusto," etc. Cp., also, Calpurn. iv, 62; Nemes. ii, 84; Boccaccio, *Ecl.* i, 82-85, x, 66.

x, 57. "In labouring of lands is (meant) hys Bucoliques." By 'Bucoliques' E.K. means Virgil's *Georgics*. Cp. Fletcher's *Elder Brother*, i, 2, 132, where the name 'Bucolicks' is applied to the third book of the *Georgics*: "and to cure your herds His Bucolicks is a masterpiece."

x, 65. "A most eloquent Oration of Tullies." *Pro Archia* (x, 24). The story that Alexander spared the house and kin of Pindar is reported by Pliny, *N. H.* vii, 29, 109, and by Arrian, *Anabasis*, i, 9, 10. Plutarch says that at the sacking of Thebes Alexander spared the descendants of Pindar (*Alex.* xi), and Dion Chrysostom states that he "bid spare the house of Pindarus" (ii, 33). The marvelous story of Darius' coffer of silver and the two books of Homer may be based on Plutarch's two statements, that Alexander constantly laid a special copy of the *Iliad* under his pillow (*Alex.* viii), and that, finding a precious casket among the property of Darius, he announced that he would keep the *Iliad* in it (*Alex.* xxvi; cp. Pliny, *N. H.* vii, 29, 108). The association of Ennius with Scipio is well known; cp. Cicero, *Pro Archia*, ix, 22.

x, 100. "Mantuanes saying, Vacuum curis diuina cerebrum Poscit." Not in the extant poems of Mantuan.

x, 105. "That comen verse, Faecundi calices quem non fecere disertum." From Horace, *Ep.* i, 5, 19. Cp. Thomas Nash, *To the Gentlemen Students of Both Universities*, "that proverbiall faecundi calices."

x, 113. "As is said in Virgile, Sola Sophocleo tua carmina digna cothurno." Virgil, *Ecl.* viii, 10. "And the like in Horace, Magnum loqui, nitique cothurno." Horace, *A. P.* 280, 'magnum-que loqui,' etc.

x, 114. "Bellona, the goddess of bataille, that is, Pallas." The identification of Bellona with Pallas is not classical, though Boccaccio has, "Minerva . . . a nonnullis Bellona appellata est," *Geneal. Deor. Gentil.* v, 48. Perhaps Spenser's 'queint Bellona' is the Cappadocian goddess who was brought to Rome during the first Mithridatic war. Cp. Martial, xii, 57, 11, 'nec turba cessat entheata Bellonae.' "As Lucian sayeth" (of the birth of Pallas). *Dial. deor.* 8.

x, 118. "As Ouid sayth, Aut si carminibus." Not in the modern texts of Ovid.

xi, 53. "As saith Virgile, Melpomene Tragico proclamat maesta boatu." The Latin verse comes from the poem *De Musis* mentioned above, on iv, 100. In Geoffroi Linocier's *Mythologia Musarum* (printed at Paris in 1583) the verse is attributed to Virgil: "Tragoediis praesidere putabatur Melpomene, ut testatur Virgilius hoc carmine: Melpomene tragico proclamat moesta boatu."

xi, 55. "So is Hecuba of Euripides, and Tantalus brought in of Seneca." "The ghost of Tantalus appears in Seneca's *Thyestes*, that of Polydorus in Euripides' *Hecuba*. Kirke's statement is somewhat confused" (C. H. Herford).

xi, 148. "A common verse, Clotho colum baiulat, Lachesis trahit, Atropos occat." *Anthol. Lat.* 792 R., "Tres sunt fatales quae ducunt fila sorores: Clotho colum baiulat, Lachesis trahit, Atropos occat."

xi, 186. "The very expresse saying of Plato in *Phaedone*." Hard to find in the *Phaedo* (where Socrates says only that the true philosophers are ever studying death, 67 E). A closer parallel is found in the *Apology*, 41 A: "Nay, if this be true, let me die again and again."

xi, 195. "Tale of Hebe, that spilt a cup of it (*sc.* nectar), and stayned the heavens." Hard to find in our handbooks of classical mythology.

xii, 11. "Virgils verse, Pan curat oues ouiumque magistros." *Ecl.* ii, 33.

xii, 40. "As Terence sayth, Qui tractant musicam, speking of Poetes." *Phormio*, Prol. 18.

xii, 84. "All which skill in starres being conuenient for shepherdes to knowe as Theocritus and the rest use." Cp. Theocr. *Id.* vii, 52-54; xiii, 25-26.

xii, 87. "The Romanes, who (as is sayd in Liue) were so superstitiously rooted in the same (*sc.* in the 'sooth of byrdes') that they agreed that euery Nobleman should put his sonne to the Thuscans, by them to be brought up in that knowledge." Perhaps this is based only on Livy, ix, 36, 3, "habeo auctores, vulgo tum Romanos pueros, sicut nunc Graecis, ita Etruscis litteris erudiri solitos, sed propius est vero," etc.

xii, 88. "As the Poete sayth, Dea saeua potentibus herbis." Virgil, *Aen.* vii, 19.

xii, Embleme. "Horace of his odes . . . boldly sayth, Exegi monumentum aere perennius, Quod nec imber edax nec aquilo vorax &c." This is a misquotation of *Od.* iii, 30, 1-3: "Exegi monumentum aere perennius . . . Quod *non* imber edax, *non* Aquilo *impotens*," etc. "Ouid in the like, Grande opus exegi quod nec Iouis ira nec ignis, Nec ferrum poterit nec edax abolere vetustas, &c." Another misquotation, from *Met.* xv, 871-2: "*Iamque* opus exegi, quod nec Iouis ira nec ignis Nec *poterit ferrum* nec edax abolere vetustas."

W. P. MUSTARD.

Johns Hopkins University.

# GERMANIC ETYMOLOGIES

1. Goth. *huzd* 'θησαυρός, hoard,' *huzdjan* 'θησαυρίζειν, lay up treasure,' ON. *hodd*, OE., OS. *hord*, OHG. *hort*, etc. are best explained as a compound \**quz-dho-*, the first part of which may be compared with Skt. *kōṣaḥ* 'Behälter, Vorratskammer, Schatzkammer,' and the second part derived from the root \**dhē-* 'put, place' (cf. Walde, *Et. Wb.*<sup>2</sup> 217 with lit.). For the use of \**dhē-* in such compounds compare Skt. *nī-dhānam* 'das Niederlegen, Aufbewahren; Aufbewahrungsort, Behälter; Schatz, Hort,' *nī-dhīḥ* id., OBulg. *obi-do* 'θησαυρός.' Here also belongs Gr. *θησαυρός* 'receptacle treasure, storehouse,' which may be analyzed as \**dhētīā-urós*: \**dhētīā* 'deposit, store': Av. *-dāiti-* 'a placing,' Goth. *gadēds*, OHG. *tāt* 'deed,' Gr. *θέω* 'a placing, deposit,' etc.; and \**urós* 'guarding': Gr. *ἐπορθεῖν* 'guard,' Skt. *vr̥ṇōti* 'cover, inclose,' Goth. *warjan* 'wehren,' OHG. *waru* 'ware, article of merchandise,' etc.

2. OE. *hēope* 'hip of the dogrose,' OS. *hiopo* 'thornbush,' OHG. *hiufo*, etc. correspond in form with Russ. *čubū* (\**qēub-*) 'schopf,'

LRuss. *čub* 'Schopf, Busch,' *čubaty* 'bei den Haaren zausen,' *čubký* pl. 'Äpfel mit in die Höhe ragendem Kelchsaum,' Czech dial. *čub* 'Vogelschopf,' *čubek* 'cirsium arvense,' Pol. *czub* 'Schopf, Büschel,' *czubić* 'beim Schopf packen.' These words are compared by Berneker, *Et. Wb.* I, 160, with Goth. *skuft* 'Haupthaar,' MHG. *schopf*, etc.

To these we may also add Norw. dial. *hupp* 'Quaste,' OE. *hoppe* 'ornament, small bell,' OHG. *hopfo* 'Hopfen,' and *witu-hopfo*, *-hopfo* 'Wiedehopf,' Lith. *kublỹs* 'Mistlerche,' named from the tufted head, and also Gr. *κύβος* 'cube,' etc. Closely related are the following with IE. *p*.

3. NHG. Swab. *häuben* 'schmerzhaft am Haare zupfen, zerren, schütteln,' *häublen* 'an den Haaren ziehen, rütteln, körperlich züchtigen': Serb.-Cr. *čupati* 'rupfen,' *čupa* 'Büschel Haare,' Russ. *čupũ* 'Schopf,' LRuss. *čuper*, *čuprýna* 'Haarschopf,' *čupryndij* 'Haubenlerche,' Czech dial. *čup* 'Berghöhe mit flachem Gipfel' (: Slovak *čub* 'Schopf, Federbusch; Bergkappe, Gipfel,' with double meaning as in NE. *crest*), IE. *\*qēup-* with which compare *\*qūp-* in ON. *húfr* 'hulk of a ship,' OE. *hȳf* 'hive,' *hūfe* 'hood,' OHG. *hūba* 'Haube,' *hubil* 'Hübel,' Norw. dial. *hof* 'knoll, hillock,' etc.

4. NE. dial. *hover* 'light, puffy, raised; not pressed down, of soil: light, loose; huncht up, cold, shivery; of birds and animals: having the coat or feathers ruffled from cold,' *vb.* 'spread lightly or loosely; pack hops lightly': ChSl. *kyprũ* 'locker, porös,' Czech *kyprjý* 'locker; aufgelaufen (von Mehlspeisen),' etc., which Berneker 677 f. combines with OBulg. *kypěti* 'wallen, überlaufen,' Skt. *kúpyati* 'gerät in Wallung, zürnt,' *cōpati* 'bewegt sich, rührt sich,' etc. To these add Dan. *hoven* 'swollen, inflated,' *hovne* 'swell up, expand,' early NE. *hoven* 'swollen, bloated, puffed out, esp. of cattle which swell with overeating,' *hove* 'raise, lift; swell, inflate, puff up or out; rise, swell out,' NE. *huff* 'a swell of sudden anger or arrogance, a fit of petulance or ill humor,' dial. *huff* 'blow, puff, breathe heavily, pant; swell, puff up; rise in baking; become angry, rage,' *hubble* 'stir, bustle, confusion,' *hobble*, *hubble* 'shake, jolt, toss; move unsteadily, shake with a quivering motion; swarm with vermin' (: Russ. *kipět'* 'wallen, sieden; aufbrausen; wimmeln'), EFris. *hubbelen* 'abwechselnd auf und nieder steigen, sich wellenförmig bewegen.'



5. OE. *cwacian* 'quake, tremble, chatter (of teeth),' *cwéccan* 'shake (hed), brandish (wepon)' may be compared with Slov. *gúgati*, Russ. dial. *gúgat'* 'schaukeln,' *gúgala* 'Schaukel,' to which Berneker, *Et. Wb.* I, 361, adds Russ. dial. *gúgl'a* 'Beule,' Pol. *guga* id., *gugutka* 'unreife Kirsche,' calling them "Lallwörter aus der Kindersprache." These last words may be derived from the IE. root *\*geu-* 'bend, bulge out,' whence many words for 'bunch, chunk, etc.,' on which see *MLN.* XIX, 1 ff.

6. On my combination of Germ. *\*kwelan* 'pine away, die' in OE. *cwelan* 'die,' etc. (cf. *IE. a²* 99) with OHG. *quellan* 'quellen,' Skt. *galati* 'fällt herab, träufelt herab,' *galitaḥ* 'verschwunden, gewichen,' etc., compare a similar change in meaning in Slavic: OBulg. *kapāti* 'tröpfeln, triefen,' Russ. *kápat'* id., *kánut'* 'zerrinnen; versinken, verschwinden,' Serb. *kāpati* 'tröpfeln; dahinschwinden, schwächen,' Pol. *kapać* 'tröpfeln,' dial. 'sterben, umkommen; verarmen.'

7. OE. *or-lege* 'hostile,' sb. 'hostility, war,' OS. *urlagi*, *urlegi* id. no doubt belong to the root *\*leg-* 'lie,' but not as usually explained. Germ. *\*uz-lagja-* 'unrest, war' is a negativ formation from *\*lagja-* 'rest, peace.' Compare Russ. *lágoda* (*\*lōgh-*) 'Friede, Ordnung, Harmonie,' Slov. *lágoda* 'Wertlosigkeit, Schwäche, Schlechtigkeit; Mutwilligkeit,' i. e. 'lowness, meanness; looseness,' etc., which we may refer to OBulg. *vŭ-lagati* 'einlegen,' *po-l.* 'hinlegen,' OE. *gelōgian* 'place; arrange,' *gelōgung* 'order,' ON. *lōga* 'part with; put away, kill'; *lāgr* 'low, low-lying'; *laga* 'put to rights, arrange, adjust,' etc.

8. MDu. *orloge* 'war, battle, strife,' *orlogen* 'make war, have a feud,' OS. *urlogi*, 'war, feud,' OHG. *urliugi* id., etc. come from Germ. *\*lugja-* *\*leugia-* with a meaning similar to *\*lagja-*. Compare ON., Nicel. *logn* 'a dead calm,' *lygn* 'calm, smooth,' Norw. *logn* 'still, calm,' ON. *lón* (*\*luhna-*) 'a quiet place in a river' and Skt. *luk* 'Abfall, Schwund,' *lūncati* 'rauft, rauft aus, enthülst.' Or Germ. *\*lug-*, *luh-* may be derived from the root *\*lēu-* in Lith. *liāutis* 'aufhören,' Czech *leviti* 'lindern, mässigen,' etc.

9. OHG. *lahs* 'Lachs,' ON. *lax*, OE. *leax* 'salmon,' Lett. *lasis*, Lith. *lāszis*, *lasziszà*, Russ. *losósi* id., etc. are undoubtedly derivatives of the root in Lith. *lāszas* 'Tropfen,' *lāszinti* 'träufeln,' Lett. *lāsa* 'Tropfen, Punkt,' *lāsains* 'punktiert, gesprenkelt,' and perhaps Russ. *lāsa*, *lasina* 'Fleck von länglicher Form, Streifen,' etc., IE.

\**lāks-* or \**lōks-*. In the latter case compare \**leg-* 'drip' in ON. *leka* 'drip, dribble, leak,' OE. *leccan* (\**lakjan*) 'wet; water,' MLG. *lecken* 'lecken lassen, destillieren,' MHG. *lecken* 'benetzen,' etc.

For meaning compare Kluge s. v. *Forelle*.

10. ON. *svað(i)* 'slippery place,' *svaða*, *sveðja* 'glide, slip,' *sváði* 'a place exposed to the wind,' OE. *swæp*, *swapu* 'track, trace,' NE. *swath* 'a line or ridge of grass, or grain, cut and thrown together by a scythe,' MLG. *swat*, *swade* id., also 'furrow,' *swade* 'scythe,' Icel. *sveðja* 'a large knife,' Norw. *svada* 'shred or slice off, flake off,' etc. may be combined with OBulg. *chvatiti* (\**syōt-*) 'greifen, ergreifen' (i. e. with a swinging motion like NE. *swipe*), Russ. *chvatit'* 'greifen, packen,' *chvatū* 'kühner, gewandter, flinker Mensch'; OBulg. *chytiti* (\**sūt-*) 'reissen, greifen, raffén,' LRuss. *chytaty* 'erschüttern, bewegen,' *chytickýj* 'schwankend,' etc., on which see Berneker, *Et. Wb.* I, 407, 414. For other related words see *IE. a<sup>2</sup>*, 118, especially Lith. *siaucziū* (\**sēut-*) 'tobe, wüte.'

11. ON. *seimr* 'honeycomb,' OHG. *seim* 'Honigseim,' MDu. *seem*, Du. *zeem* id. was used primarily of the 'comb' not the honey itself. Hence the later development, as in NHG. *seim*, does not justify connection of the word with Gr. *αἷμα* 'blood.' The 'honeycomb,' because of its reticular surface, is here described as 'corded, sewed,' a parallel to OHG. *waba* 'Wabe,' primarily 'web.' Compare ON. *seimr* 'cord, rope': *sime* 'cord, string,' OE. *sima* 'band, chain,' etc., and Lett. *schūt* (\**siū-* 'nähen; Zellen machen (von Bienen),' *schūni* 'Honigscheiben; Zellen der Bienen,' *schūnōt* 'locker, zellig, schwammig machen,' 'honeycomb,' Lith. *siūti* 'nähen': *syva* (\**siuā* 'a sewing') 'Honigseim': Skt. *sivanam* 'das Nähen.'

12. OE. *camb* 'honeycomb,' Germ. \**kambō-*, the fem. of *camb* 'comb,' Germ. \**kamba-*, is likewise descriptiv of the striated surface of the honeycomb, with especial reference to the interstices. Hence the use of NE. *honeycomb* as a verb.

13. Germ. \**hrētō(n)-* 'honeycomb,' whence Vulgar Lat. *frāta* id., occurs in OLFranc. *rāta*, MDu. *rāte*, Du. *raat*, MHG. *rāze*, *rāz* etc. This is compared with MHG. *raz(e)* 'Scheiterhaufen, pyre' (Kluge s. v. *Ross*<sup>2</sup>), OBulg. *krada* (\**qrōdā*) 'Scheiterhaufen, Holzstoss' (Franck, *Et. Wb.*,<sup>2</sup> 530). This, however, does not imply an original meaning 'Geflecht, Gewebe,' as Kluge claims,

but is rather as if we should call the honeycomb a grate or grill in reference to the intersecting lines.

As a whole the honeycomb is also described as a 'disk,' 'cake,' 'loaf,' as in NHG. *honigscheibe*, -*fladen*, -*kuchen*, Swed. *honingskaka*, etc. Here belong OE. *bēo-brēad* 'bee-bred, honeycomb,' MHG. *bīe-brōt* 'Honigscheibe.'

14. OE. *scāp* 'sheep,' OS. *scāp*, OHG. *scāf* id. may represent pre-Germ. \**skēbom* or \**skēbnom* (or -*pnom*) 'shorn, fleest, clipt, stript (animal).' We might compare Goth. *skaban* 'shave,' Lith. *skapoti* 'schaben,' Gr. *σκέπαρον* 'ax' if these all belong to the *e*-series. In any case *sheep* may be derived from the root \**seq*- 'cut.'

For meaning compare ON. *fár* 'sheep,' Gr. *πόκος* 'a shearing, fleece, wool': *πέκω* 'shear, clip, pluck.' So also Gr. *τὰ λεπτά τῶν προβάτων* 'sheep, goats' should be explained not as 'small cattle,' but as 'clipt cattle': *λεπτός* 'peeled off, stript,' *λέπω* 'strip off, peel,' *λοπός* 'shell, husk, bark, lether, hide.' The fleece or pelts of sheep and goats were most frequently stript off to serve as clothing.

15. MLG. *hōken* 'Böckchen, von Ziegen und Schafen,' OE. *hēcen* 'kid'; *hacele* (pelt) 'mantle,' Goth. *hakuls* id., OBulg. *koza* 'Ziege,' *koža* 'δέρις, δερμα, pellis,' Russ. *kóža* 'abgezogene Haut, Fell, Leder; Haut der Menschen; Schale von Früchten,' *kožurá* 'Haut, Rinde, Schale,' etc. (cf. Berneker, *Et. Wb.* I, 595, 597) point to a root \**qoġ-* or \**qaġ-* 'hack, tear, tease, etc.' Compare OE. *haccian* 'hack,' OFris. *tōhakkia* 'zerhacken,' MHG. *hacken*, etc., *hachel*, *hechel* 'Hechel,' NE. *hatchel*, *hetchel*, *heckle* 'comb for flax or hemp,' *vb.* 'comb, as flax or hemp; tease with questions,' OE. *haca* 'hook,' *hacod* 'pike (fish)'; *hōcor* 'derision,' primarily 'a combing, heckling, teasing,' OHG. *huoh* 'Spott': OBulg. *is-kaziti* 'verderben, vernichten,' *pro-kaza* 'Aussatz' (compare Gr. *λεπρός* 'scabby, scaly': *λέπρα* 'leprosy'), Russ. *kazít'* 'entstellen, verderben, beschädigen, verstümmeln,' *pro-kázit'* 'mutwillige Streiche anstellen,' Slov. *kazíti* 'verderben, verhunzen,' Serb.-Cr. *na-káziti* 'entstellen, zeichnen (von Gott zur Strafe),' *nákazan* 'von Gott gezeichnet,' etc. (incorrectly combined with OBulg. *čeznŋti* 'erlöschen, schwinden,' Berneker 498): Slov. *kazen* 'Strafe,' *kazniti* 'strafen,' Russ. *kaznít'* 'hart strafen, heimsuchen; hinrichten,' *kazni* 'Strafe; Hinrichtung,' OBulg. *kazni* 'Anordnung; Strafe,' *kazati* 'zeigen, mahnen,' etc., primarily 'score, mark.'

16. NE. *hector* 'a bully; one who teases or vexes,' *vb.* 'threaten, bully; fret at, chide, scold, tease' is wrongly supposed to be a derivativ of Hector, the Trojan hero. It is probably rather a noun of agency derived from an OE. \**heccettan*, a freq. of *haccian* 'hack.'

17. Norw. *tira* 'stieren, genau zusehen,' *tir* 'Spähen, Glanz,' ON. *tirr* 'glory, honor,' OE., OS. *tir* id., etc. may, in addition to the words usually given, be compared with Lat. *dirus* 'portentous, ominous, boding, ill-omend, fearful, awful; abominable, dreadful, horrible,' *dirae* 'portents unlucky signs; Furies,' IE. \**diros* 'appearing, appearance, sight: glorious, glory; portentous, terrible.' For this double meaning compare the ultimate related Skt. *divyati* 'shine,' LRuss. *dyvítý sá* 'schauen,' OBulg. *divŭ* 'Wunder,' Serb.-Cr. *divan* 'wunderbar, wunderschön,' Czech *div* 'Wunder,' *divný* 'wunderbar, sonderbar, schrecklich,' ORuss. *divŭ* 'Wunder, Schreckbild.'

18. *wæl-cyrige* 'sorceress,' ON. *val-kyrja* 'Walküre' contains a Germ. \**kuzjōn-* 'chooser, seer,' which has a counterpart in this sense in Lat. *augur* 'diviner, seer' from \**avi-gus* 'omen-chooser, omen-seer,' *au-gurium* 'the observance and interpretation of omens, divination' (for the first part *avi-* see Walde, *Et. Wb.*,<sup>2</sup> 73), *augustus* (omen-chosen) 'consecrated, sacred; worshipful, august': Skt. *juṣṭa-*, Av. *zušta-* 'beliebt, erwünscht'; OHG. *kiosan* 'prüfen, erforschen, wahrnehmen, wählen,' MLG. *kēsen* 'wählen, suchen; sehen, bemerken,' OSwed. *kiūsa* 'bezaubern.'

FRANCIS A. WOOD.

University of Chicago.

## TWO FOSTER BROTHERS OF D'ARTAGNAN

D'Artagnan has become, thanks to Dumas père, a member of the great family of literary heroes. Few readers know even the name of his first biographer, Gatien de Courtitz, altho Dumas acknowledges his debt and has drawn some of his most famous episodes from the pseudo-memoirs published in 1700. Where Courtitz got his information must remain a mystery. His claim to be acting merely as the editor of papers left by the famous musketeer<sup>1</sup> was

<sup>1</sup>For D'Artagnan, see *Rev. pol. et lit.*, 10 mars 1888; Ch. Samaran, *D'Artagnan*, Paris, 1912.

vigorously denied by Bayle. Perhaps Courtilz, himself a soldier, had heard anecdotes from veteran comrades of D'Artagnan, and it is not impossible that he may have known him in the army.

As all the *Mémoires* written by Courtilz are recognized as possessing some historical value, always subject to caution, it may be worth while to follow the records of two other heroes who certainly lived: La Fontaine and Montbrun. Their *Mémoires* (1698 and 1701, respectively), as well as those of D'Artagnan (1700), show a lively interest in England, not found in earlier works. Whence came this new theme? I submit an explanation which seems probable.

Lelong says that Courtilz met at the Bastille, during his imprisonment, the Duke of Tyrconnel, "qui lui raconta tout ce qu'il savait de ce qui s'était passé sous le règne de Charles I . . . et sous l'usurpation de Cromwell. Ce fut sur ces récits qu'il composa *Les Mémoires du Duc de Tirconnel*." These *Mémoires* have never appeared,<sup>2</sup> and there is no evidence that the Duke was ever in the Bastille. However, in *Les Annales de la Cour* (1701), Courtilz speaks of a natural son of Tyrconnel, named Talbot, who was imprisoned there. The *Archives de la Bastille* show that a Talbot, corresponding to Courtilz' description, was a prisoner from March 31, 1696, to Dec. 22, 1697. As Courtilz was incarcerated from 1693 to 1699, he may well have obtained information from him.

*Les Mémoires de La Fontaine, seigneur de Savoye et de Fontenay*, relate how the hero,<sup>3</sup> at the outbreak of the war with the Prince of Orange, offered his services to Louvois and was made a brigadier in the expeditionary force sent to Ireland. Altho he never reached his destination, he discourses at some length upon the Duke of Tyrconnel, who was in command there. His vessel was captured by the English who tried to persuade him to join them. He feigned to consent, and began his career as a spy. He enjoyed the full confidence of the Prince and claims to have been in constant communication with Louvois. Later he was sent by the English to draw up a report on the French Protestants in Poitou. From there he

<sup>2</sup> A notice by Courtilz in the *Elite des nouvelles* (1698) of a forthcoming book about England seems to refer to these *Mémoires*.

<sup>3</sup> He declares himself native of Anjou, and a natural son of Artus, duc de Bretagne. La Fontaine is the name of his maternal grandmother. He does not explain his other titles.



carried on a double correspondance with Louvois and the English court, acting, as he claims, under orders from the former. Recalled to Paris, he was suddenly arrested and confined in the Bastille.

The *Archives de la Bastille* show that on Dec. 27, 1689, a sieur de Fontenay was arrested by order of Louvois on a charge of criminal intercourse with the enemy. He is described as "un petit homme qui a une joue balafnée." In the preface to the *Mémoires* we read: "M. de Fontenai est petit: il a une physionomie fort mauvaise, et cette méchante mine est encore augmentée par la cicatrice d'une blessure, qu'il a audessous de l'œil. Il est maigre et mince, tel qu'il se représente lui-même en parlant de l'enflure de son corps à la Bastille." It may be worth noting that Courtilz has not described so precisely the person of any of his other heroes.

On March 16, 1692, Pontchartrain wrote to Barbezieux: "Le Roi est informé que le Prince d'Orange a envoyé en France un officier français, nommé Fontenay, qui fut pris, il y a deux ans, en Irlande, étant au service du roi d'Angleterre (Jacques II), et qui s'est mis depuis à celui du prince d'Orange." Barbezieux replied: "M. de Louvois a fait mettre à la Bastille, au mois de décembre 1689, un Fontenay de Poitou, homme hardi, qui avait passé d'Angleterre en France, chargé de quelque ordre de la part du prince d'Orange, pour faciliter les descentes dont il nous menaçait en ce temps-là, lequel, en ayant fait un prétendu sacrifice à M. de Louvois, et offert de servir le Roi en cette occasion, fut apparemment surpris jouant double, et mis à la Bastille. . . . Cet homme a une femme étrangère et une sœur qui ont souvent sollicité sa liberté sans l'obtenir."

The *Mémoires* relate an incident which may throw light on the immediate cause of the hero's arrest. While in England, he became enamoured of the supposed niece, really the mistress, of another French spy of doubtful fidelity. Having seduced her, he brought her back to France, where she promptly betrayed her "uncle," and endeavored to cast doubts on the loyalty of her new lover. As for his foreign wife, the *Mémoires* relate his marriage with a Dutch lady, with whom he returned to France. We read also of his sister, with whom he was constantly quarreling, and who did her utmost to prolong his stay in the Bastille. Only his wife remained faithful to him.

There would seem to be no doubt that the main source for these *Mémoires* is from conversation with fellow captives.

The *Mémoires du Marquis de Montbrun* are unfinished, but it seems certain that the original intention was to relate the English Revolution. We have here an interesting source problem, for many details given by Courtilz are confirmed or glossed by Anselme and Tallemant. Perhaps conversations with Talbot and Fontenay put him on the scent.

Montbrun declares himself the natural son of the duc de Bellegarde by a "pâtissière de la rue Saint-André des Arts." At the time of the great Jubilee (1606) his mother avowed to her husband the secret of his birth. Banished from home and rebuffed by his noble father, the lad depended on skillful trickery at tennis to eke out a living. Going to England, he presented himself as the son of Bellegarde, and rapidly won the favor of the king, Charles I. Tennis, played for large stakes, was fashionable, and Montbrun soon made his fortune. Back at Paris, he finds Bellegarde in need of money, and by the payment of 50,000 crowns obtains recognition as a natural son. He is soon entangled by his father in the conspiracy of Gaston d'Orléans, and claims to have fought at Castelnaudary.

Anselme says that Roger, duc de Bellegarde, died in 1646 without legitimate offspring. He continues: "Pierre de Bellegarde, dit le Marquis de Montbrun, seigneur de Sous-Carrière près de Gros Bois en Brie, fut légitimé par lettres du mois d'avril 1628, épousa Anne des Rogers. . . . Il eut un fils naturel, Charles Henry de Bellegarde, . . . légitimé et anobli au mois de décembre 1652, qu'il fit élever avec grand soin." In the act of legitimation of his son (Bibl. Nat., *Cab. d'Hoz.*, No. 37), and in his marriage contract (cited by Jal), Pierre is called "premier chambellan d'affaires du duc d'Orléans." In the latter document he is also called "Seigneur de Soucarrière." The *Mémoires de M. d'Artagnan* mention a Soucarière (sic), natural son of the duc de Bellegarde, who had made a fortune in England by his skill at tennis. Montbrun himself tells us that he took the name of Soucarière (sic) at the time of his sojourn in England. He does not explain its origin, nor that of Marquis de Montbrun, by which he is called in Anselme and in the act of legitimation of his son. But Tallemant, who has given an historiette to our hero, says that Souscarrière is the name of an estate which he bought as soon as he had acquired a fortune. Tallemant adds that he was called Montbrun after his marriage.

Tallemant, like Courtitz, says that Montbrun's mother was the wife of a "pâtissier," but neither takes his supposed paternity very seriously. Tallemant says: "Ce pâtissier avait une femme assez jolie, à qui plusieurs personnes firent leur cour, et entre autres, M. de Bellegarde. Vers le temps des embrassements de M. de Bellegarde, cette femme se sentit grosse et accoucha d'un fils." Tallemant adds that the lad was a skillful tennis player, and won heavily by trickery. He describes as follows the recognition of Montbrun by the duke: "Comme il (Souscarrière) eut un grand fonds, le petit la Lande, qui le connaissait . . . lui dit un jour: 'Pardieu, M. de Souscarrière, vous êtes bien fait, vous avez de l'esprit, vous avez du cœur, vous êtes adroit et heureux; il ne vous manque que de la naissance: promettez-moi dix mille écus, et je vous fais reconnaître par M. de Bellegarde pour son fils naturel. Il a besoin d'argent; vous lui en pouvez prêter. Voici le grand jubilé: votre mère jouera bien son personnage: elle ira lui déclarer que vous êtes à lui et point au pâtissier: qu'en conscience elle ne peut souffrir que vous ayez le bien d'un homme qui n'est point votre père.' Souscarrière s'y accorda. La pâtissière fit sa harangue; M. de Bellegarde toucha son argent, et la Lande pareillement. Voilà Souscarrière, en un matin, devenu le chevalier de Bellegarde."

Montbrun tells the story as follows: "Or cette année (du grand jubilé) étant arrivée, il y eut des missionnaires qui se répandirent dans toutes les paroisses de Paris. . . . Ils opérèrent des conversions admirables pour fruit de leurs prédications, et ma mère, les étant allée entendre comme les autres, elle en revint si touchée qu'elle s'en fut à l'heure même à confesse. M. le curé de Saint-André-des-Arts fut celui entre les mains de qui elle tomba. Elle s'accusa de m'avoir introduit dans la famille de son mari, quoique je ne fusse pas son fils: qu'elle avait eu commerce avec M. le duc de Bellegarde . . . que c'était lui qui était mon véritable père. . . . Je ne sais comment elle pouvait répondre ainsi que j'étais le fils de M. le duc de Bellegarde, et non pas celui du pâtissier. Car il me semble que cela est assez difficile à une femme, à moins que de faire lit à part avec l'un, pendant qu'elle couche avec l'autre. Mais que cela soit ou non, cela n'importe guère à mon sujet; tout ce qu'il y a à dire là-dessus, c'est qu'il fallait bien qu'elle fût assurée de son fait, puisque, non contente de l'avoir dit à son curé, elle consentit encore qu'il en vînt apporter la nouvelle à son mari."

It seems certain that the two authors are using the same source, but we must note that Tallemant places the recognition of Montbrun by the duke in 1606, and that he speaks of him as already wealthy. According to the *Mémoires*, he was but a child at that date, and was recognized only some time before the battle of Castelnaudary (1632). Anselme gives the date of legitimation as 1628.

Tallemant speaks of the sojourn of Montbrun in England whither he had gone "pour se-remplumer de quelque perte qu'il avait faite," and where he won much money by gambling and ruse.

The *Mémoires* do not relate the marriage of Montbrun, but Courtitz certainly meant to do so. Jal notes some irregularities in the contract between Pierre de Bellegarde and Anne Derogers. Probably the explanation is to be found in this remark of Tallemant's: "Souscarrière enleva la fille d'un nommé Rogers. . . . L'affaire s'accommoda et on disait qu'il eût eu beaucoup de bien, sans le désordre qui arriva. Cette femme se laissa cajoler par Villandry. . . . Il (Montbrun) en découvrit quelque chose." Tallemant adds that Montbrun thought of killing his wife, but finally pardoned her on condition of never seeing her again. Also that he fought a duel with Villandry on the Place Royale after having slapped him in church, and that the queen was blamed for not punishing this sacrilege. The *Mémoires* allude to a "combat dans la Place Royale avec Villandry, qui n'a été uniquement que pour l'amour de ma femme. . . . Je méritais bien, pour en dire la vérité, qu'on me coupât le cou. . . . Il ne serait pas à propos de parler présentement du combat que je fis contre Villandry, puisque je ne le pourrais faire que par anticipation."

Tallemant makes light of the military prowess of Montbrun. "Il dit que cette vie-là n'était pas sa vie." Possibly his rôle at Castelnaudary, as told in the *Mémoires*, was suggested by the *Mémoires de Pontis*, which seem to have exercised considerable influence on Courtitz' work. Pontis claims to have been one of the captors of Montmorency at this battle. Montbrun declares that he took part in the mad charge which resulted in the capture.

We know that the duke of Bellegarde was constantly engaged in intrigues against Richelieu and took an active part in the revolts of his chief, Gaston d'Orléans.

BENJ. M. WOODBRIDGE.

*The Rice Institute.*

## TITUS ANDRONICUS ONCE MORE

In *Mod. Lang. Notes* for January of this year there appeared an article by Mr. Tucker Brooke entitled "*Titus Andronicus* and Shakespeare." It is an attack upon my paper on "The Authorship of *Titus Andronicus*" in the Flügel Memorial Volume (1916). I shall endeavor not to be enticed by the tone of Mr. Brooke's article into making a reply in the same spirit; for I would not be responsible for another of those disgraceful quarrels which have too often taken place among the critics of Shakespeare. He of all men should be most free from bickering and carping commentators who was himself of "demeanor no lesse civill than excelent in the qualitie he professes." But it is essential, both for my own credit and for the clearing up of the points in question, that I should call attention to Mr. Brooke's chief inaccuracies of statement and define more clearly my position where he has apparently misunderstood it.

The papers in a Memorial volume are not limited to any set number of pages, but there is an implicit obligation upon each contributor to condense rather than to elaborate his material. I do not urge this as an excuse for the neglect of essential matters: I do not consider it necessary or desirable to re-examine data which one is accepting without dispute. But it may account for my beginning my article "with a lunge that is apt to scandalize precisians in the critical game." Let me explain my point.

The common assumption among scholars that Shakespeare began his dramatic career by revising plays and that he acquired a knowledge of his art by serving an apprenticeship in this humbler pursuit before he ventured upon the composition of an original drama is based upon the general agreement that this is the logical sequence and upon no actual authority, unless the statement of Greene that he was "an absolute *Johannes Factotum*" be taken in this sense. But even if so, the *Groatsworth of Wit* was of 1592 and refers to Shakespeare's present, not his first endeavors; while Ravenscroft's assertion that he gave only "some master touches" to *Titus Andronicus* was made nearly (if not quite) an entire century after that play was written. The view, then, which has become estab-



lished by constant repetition is based upon the merest assumption of likelihood, and we may well question if it is indeed as probable as it has seemed. There are two reasons why it does not appear so to me. One is, that the impulse of a young man who feels drawn toward dramatic composition is to try his hand forthwith at the writing of a drama—not to seek entrance into the shop where dramas are recast and offer his services there; the other and more cogent reason is that any man who has in his gift the revision of a play will demand credentials—some convincing reason for supposing that the young aspirant is fitted for his task; and there can be no satisfying proof of this other than actual dramatic composition. Any man may submit a play he has written, and it may be read and produced; but unless Shakespeare had some special influence to bring to bear, of which we have no knowledge or indication, it does not seem plausible to me that the task of revising a play would be given to him until he had shown something of his quality as a playwright.

These were the considerations which led me to suggest my first point of departure; and I based them upon what I believed to be universal conditions and a fundamental psychology. I did not rest my case upon the modern analogy which I mentioned in passing. Nor did I belie my own statement "by unquestioning acceptance of Shakespeare's employment as reviser of *Henry VI.*" I consider that Shakespeare had become sufficiently established by his original plays of *Titus Andronicus* and *Love's Labour's Lost* to be entrusted with work of revision before he did anything with *Henry VI.* Mr. Brooke, in endeavoring to answer my contention, says that "it was a regular thing for *obscure*<sup>1</sup> writers to revise the work of the greatest, for Birde and Rowley to amplify *Doctor Faustus* and 'Begemy Jonson' in his days of servitude to produce additions to the *Spanish Tragedy.*" From the point of view of the professional manager, whether then or now, there is a vast difference between the untried and the 'obscure' writer of plays; and since Mr. Brooke accuses me of a *non-sequitur* I take some pleasure in recording this one. And I cannot forbear to remark in passing that Henslowe paid Jonson for additions to the *Spanish Tragedy* on September 25, 1601, and that Jonson was well out of his days of servitude when he had produced *Every Man in his Humour*, *Every Man Out of his*

<sup>1</sup> My italics.

*Humour, The Case Is Altered, Cynthia's Revels, and The Poet-aster.*<sup>2</sup>

But when Mr. Brooke says, "No mention is made of the early editions or notices in Henslowe and the *Stationers' Register*, though much of this material is certainly pertinent and, it seems to me, adverse to Mr. Gray's thesis," he implies a fault of which I have never yet been guilty. I distinctly refer to the "*Titus and Vespacia* which was 'new' according to Henslowe in 1591" (p. 123, n.), and I record that Henslowe mentions this play in all six times (p. 122); I note also that *Titus and Vespasia* was performed by Lord Strange's men and *Titus Andronicus* by Pembroke's men. None of the other familiar facts to which Mr. Brooke refers stood either for or against the hypothesis I had put forward. I was aware of those facts; I was equally aware that everyone who read my article with intelligence would also be cognisant of them; if they had been pertinent I should surely have introduced them; if they had been adverse to my thesis I should not have let them go without the most careful consideration. Truly, I have not tried to conceal such data as we find in Henslowe's Diary and the *Stationers' Register*, nor have I tried to hold back the date of the First Quarto! And it somewhat surprises me that a scholar should throw out the casual observation that *much* of this material *seems to him* adverse to my thesis without the faintest hint of *how* it is adverse to my thesis. Yet this comes from the man who has just accused my method of being "ingenuous and the reverse of technical," and is about to brand it as a method of "proof by pure assertion." Indeed, in the sentence from which I have just quoted (p. 34), Mr. Brooke writes: "Ignoring all the external evidence except that of the Folio editors and of Meres." There is, so far as I am aware, just one other piece of external evidence, and this I have not ignored; for I wrote: "That *Titus Andronicus* was acted by Pembroke's men is an argument against Shakespeare's having *revised* the piece, rather than against his original authorship of it"—a consideration which I wish those who hold to the traditional view would take more definitely into account.<sup>3</sup> I am not in the habit of concealing evidence; rather I

<sup>2</sup> Henslowe's other entry, for new additions, to which Mr. Brooke's reference seems more definitely to be made, is to 'bengemy Johnstone' (not 'Bengemy Jonson') and is dated 'the 22 of June, 1602.'

<sup>3</sup> Mr. Brooke cannot be referring again to the Henslowe references, for the only use these have been put to which would entitle them to be called

incline to feature any point which seems to stand against my theory. In my article on *Titus Andronicus* I wrote: "But let me not be of those who, having formed a theory, bend all the evidence to sustain it. There are objections . . ." And again, "I have not been able to satisfy myself at every point," telling just how and why. This is "proof by pure assertion" except in two particulars: that it disclaims being proof, and avoids pure assertion.

Nor do I argue in a circle regarding the Meres reference. I say that Meres included every other play (so far as we know) of which Shakespeare was the original author and no other play of which he was only the reviser; and that no other hypothesis has been put forward which satisfactorily explains the inclusion of *Titus Andronicus* and the rejection of *Henry VI* and *The Taming of the Shrew*. That Mr. Brooke should bring up *The Troublesome Reign* in this connection seems to me unworthy of so excellent a scholar. Surely I do not need to prove with solemn laboriousness that Shakespeare's *King John* is an original drama in a sense in which *Henry VI* and *The Taming of the Shrew* are not.

It would be easy, but I trust superfluous, to defend my having devoted so much of my paper on "The Authorship of *Titus Andronicus*" to the essential task of examining opposing views and to an inquiry into its characteristics of style.<sup>4</sup> What I more resent is Mr. Brooke's assertion that only in considering the double endings do I "again venture into the open," and that I do not "come to grips" with my argument after the second page. I had early announced my thesis, that "the distinctively Shakespearean passages are for the most part inherent in the structure of the drama. . . . On the other hand, those parts of the play which are most un-Shakespearean have in every instance a structural explana-

"external evidence" is in the widely accepted theory of Fuller; and to Fuller's theory I have definitely recorded my objections.

'In saying that "successful identification of Shakespeare's style" would not prove his responsibility for the plot and structure of *Titus Andronicus*, Mr. Brooke shows me that I must write in a manner which is singularly difficult for even a trained scholar to follow. I wrote: "It is a presumption by which I am quite willing to stand that if Shakespeare was the original author of *Titus Andronicus*, the main body of the play as we now have it is of his making" (p. 114). It was necessary, therefore, to examine the style in order to ascertain, if possible, whether the main portion of the play exhibited characteristics of the early Shakespeare, and which portions were most obviously not in his manner. Do I make myself clear?

tion for their having been inserted." The last part of my paper is wholly devoted to an investigation of the passages which appear, on an examination of the structure of the drama, to be the added portions—the work of the revisers; and I give, as best I can, my reasons for believing that these very passages are the most un-Shakespearean portions of the play. So far as I knew when I wrote this article, or as I can see now, this is all quite in the open. Indeed, it is the most crucial point in my argument.

Mr. Brooke concludes his criticism, except for a paragraph of miscellaneous accusations, by attacking the statistics I present regarding the double endings, though the apostle of "cautious laboriousness" remarks that he has not "had the heart" to check them up except in the first act of the *Battle of Alcazar*. In saying that "Marlowe *never* employs the double ending as frequently as Shakespeare *always* employs it," which so scandalizes Mr. Brooke and fills him with uncorroborated incredulity, I was speaking of the percentages in entire dramas. My statement was introduced by a "This means" after giving the percentages for Marlowe's plays, as I had for the early plays of Shakespeare. Of course Shakespeare has some scenes in which the double ending is not employed at all. According to my counting, Marlowe's play of highest percentage, *Edward II*, falls just under Shakespeare's play of lowest percentage, *King John*. This is not a matter to exclaim about, and to inform the world of scholars that it "outrages" you. It is a matter for verification or disproof, and for a discreet silence in the meanwhile.

Mr. Brooke calls attention to Marlowe's *Lucan* (not observing that I had definitely taken this poem into account) and *Hero and Leander*. The very discrepancy in double ending percentages shows clearly enough that the set poems furnish no criterion for Marlowe's custom in dramatic dialogue. I do not "rest a categorical denial of the possibility" of anything whatever on double ending percentages. My whole consideration of the matter was to show that *Titus Andronicus* does as a matter of fact conform with Shakespeare's custom in this particular, and does not conform with the custom of such other dramatists of the time as have been put forward as possible authors of the piece.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Perhaps Mr. Brooke would not make so much commotion about so impersonal a matter if he had not committed himself to a false deduction in his important and valuable discussion of *The Authorship of the Second*

A consideration which I have not seen mentioned in this connection is that some of Shakespeare's early contemporaries who are very sparing in their use of double endings, allow themselves much more freedom when the end-word of the line is a proper name. In my counting I have at times compared these dramatists when this special type of double ending was excluded; and I suggest that supplementary tables be always given where the practice of the dramatist in question makes it a matter of special significance. It is so with Peele. Peele has thirteen double endings in the first act of the *Battle of Alcazar*, but only four exclusive of proper names.<sup>6</sup> I included the reckoning I had made on this basis without remembering that it was on this basis that I had made it; and I hasten with eagerness and thankfulness to recognize and admit the one instance in which Mr. Brooke has really been accurate in his discussion of my paper.

But to my theory regarding the composition of *Titus Andronicus* Mr. Brooke has raised not the slightest obstacle; he has made no contribution to the subject. He has juggled with the reputation of a fellow-student; and on a careful and candid examination of the serious charges brought forward we find the truth in them reduced to an inadvertency in recording the number of double

and *Third Parts of King Henry VI* (Conn. Acad. of Arts and Sciences, 1912). The 7% of double endings in the *True Tragedy* would by Mr. Brooke's own figures be an indication of collaboration between Marlowe and Shakespeare rather than of Marlowe's sole authorship, for the highest percentage for any of the undisputed plays Mr. Brooke gives as 4½ for *Edward II*. This, I presume, is his "differs considerably" from my estimate of 3.8%. But one should not find a difference of about one-half of one per cent. so considerable when he identifies 5.0 + % with "nearly 6%" in the first act of the *Battle of Alcazar*. A true precisian should be more precise. Mr. Brooke's countings tend to run above mine, possibly because he counts some lines which I reject as doubtful. But our results should be *relatively* the same for the various dramas.

<sup>6</sup> A fifth instance, which would make Mr. Brooke's fourteen, might be found in the line,

Murdering his uncle and his brethren,

which I had read,

Murdering / his un- / cle and / his breth- / (e) ren,

because of Peele's pronunciation of "brethren" as a trisyllable; *e. g.*:

And disinherit us his brethren,

in scene I, line 80, of this act.



endings in the first act of the *Battle of Alcazar*. In my work on Shakespeare I emphasize always points of dramaturgy rather than those which have received a proportionately fuller consideration from most scholars. This could easily be mistaken for a neglect of crucial data and an undue haste in arriving at conclusions. If these were real instead of seeming faults, Mr. Brooke would have done well in exposing me; but what I have written is accessible, and I lay it not before the modern public which is "pitifully receptive of new theories," but before those who are competent to judge.

HENRY DAVID GRAY.

*Leland Stanford Junior University.*

---

### FIELDING NOTES

#### 1. The Composition of *Pasquin*.

That Fielding's plays were written in haste has been a common assertion of his critics. It is, therefore, rather interesting to discover just how short a time he spent on the composition of *Pasquin*, his famous "Satire on the Times." Presented on Friday, March 5, 1736, it must have been in rehearsal at least as early as Monday, March 1, and yet it contains an allusion to an event which happened as late as February 16.

There are three allusions in all bearing upon the date of composition. The first is in Act I, where Fustian, the author of the tragedy, speaking in defence of his Ghost, says: "I think it is not amiss to remind People of those things which they are, now-a-days, too apt to disbelieve; besides, we have lately had an *Act* against Witches, and I don't question but shortly we shall have one against Ghosts." The act referred to here can be no other than the Witchcraft Bill (9 Geo. II, c. 5), which was read for the first time on January 27, 1736, and which was passed on February 11. This was an act to repeal the act against witchcraft of the first year of James I. It was, in effect, an abolishing of the belief in witches, and thus fits in with the meaning of the text.

The second allusion is in Act II. The third voter says to the colonel: "I have read in a Book call'd *Fog's Journal*, that your Honour's Men are to be made of Wax." This is a reference to an interesting article which appeared in *Fog's Journal* for January 17,



1736, an anonymous letter humorously proposing to create an army of wax-work which would be quite as useful as the real army.

The third allusion is in Act IV, where Law, in speaking of direful omens, says:

The other Day

A mighty Deluge swam into our Hall,  
As if it meant to wash away the Law:  
Lawyers were forc'd to ride on Porters shoulders;  
One, O Prodigious Omen! tumbled down,  
And he and all his Briefs were sous'd together.

This is most certainly a reference to the high tide of February 16, 1736, which flooded Westminster Hall when the Court of Common Pleas was sitting, an account of which is given in the *Gentleman's Magazine* of February, 1736, and the *Daily Advertiser* of February 17. There is even specific allusion to an accident mentioned in the *Daily Journal*, and quoted in the *Grub-Street Journal* of February 19 as follows: "A porter carrying one of the counsellors thro' the Hall upon his back, the water was so high that he fell down, and they both were like to be drowned."

We thus have allusions to contemporary happenings of January and February, 1736, and if these were seized upon by Fielding while he was writing the play, as I am for several reasons inclined to believe, rather than inserted in a play already written, we have good reason to believe that the first part of *Pasquin*, containing the comedy, was not written until after January 27 at least, and possibly not until after February 11; and that the second part, containing the tragedy, was not written until after February 16, when the rehearsal must have been less than two weeks away. It does not necessarily follow, however, that *Pasquin* was written carelessly.

## 2. Date of *The Historical Register*.

It is customary to refer to *The Historical Register* as having been performed late in March or about the first of April, 1737. Such a statement is based upon the earliest known advertisement, which is found in the *Daily Journal* for Wednesday, April 6. It is in reality only a note to an advertisement of the publication of Lillo's *Fatal Curiosity*, and states that the performance of April 11 would be the ninth day of both *Fatal Curiosity* and *The Historical Register*. It would seem an easy undertaking to reckon back from Monday, April 11, the ninth day, and fix the first performance of

*The Historical Register* for Friday, April 1. There are, however, several objections to such a procedure.

In the first place, the fact that the advertisements printed in the *Daily Journal* of Wednesday, April 6, the *London Daily Post* of Thursday, April 7, and the *Daily Journal* of Friday, April 8, are all for the performance of Monday, April 11, would indicate that there were no performances on Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, and Saturday. These days fell in Passion Week. In the second place, the *Grub-Street Journal* for March 24, 1737, says: "We are informed, that the Tragedy called *The Fatal Curiosity*, now acting in the Hay-Market, and puffed in the Papers as a *New Performance*, was acted there last year, under the Title of *Guilt its own punishment*." This is strong evidence that *The Historical Register*, which was being acted with *Fatal Curiosity*, was being performed as early as March 24, 1737.

Now on just what day was the first performance given? The answer is to be found, I am firmly convinced, in the announcement of Auctioneer Hen in the second act of the play. Hen announces his auction, which is the big scene of the play, as occurring "on Monday, the 21st Day of *March*." Since the twenty-first of March actually fell on a Monday in 1737, and since the first performance cannot be thought of as much earlier than the twenty-fourth, it is a natural assumption that Fielding was here using the actual date of the first performance. It is, at least, a coincidence too striking to be disregarded, and it fits in well with the reference to the plays three days later as "now acting."

### 3. A New Fielding Letter.

In May, 1737, there was printed a controversy which largely concerned the political aspects of Fielding's *Pasquin* and *The Historical Register*. I refer to a vigorous letter signed "An Adventurer in Politicks," which appeared in the *Daily Gazetteer* of May 7, and the vigorous answer to it which appeared in *Common Sense* May 21. This second letter, signed, like the dedication of *Tumble-Down Dick*, by Fielding's pseudonym, "Pasquin," has never been included in any of Fielding's works, but I shall try to show, both by internal evidence and one external source, that it was nevertheless written by Fielding himself.

In the first place it shows Fielding's use of "hath."<sup>1</sup> It is in other respects in the style of Fielding's dedication of *The Historical Register*, and the frank coarseness of the allusion to Ward's Pill, with which the letter concludes, is typical. The use of the first person, while not conclusive of Fielding's authorship, nevertheless helps to strengthen the case in such sentences as, "I shall not be industrious to deny, what you are so good as to declare, that I am buoy'd up by the greatest Wits, and finest Gentlemen of the Age," and "*The Historical Register*, and *Eurydice Hiss'd*, being now publish'd, shall answer for themselves against what you are pleased to say concerning them: but as you are pleased to assert that I have insinuated that all Government is a Farce . . . I shall quote the lines on which you ground your assertions . . . I am far from asserting that all Government is a *Farce*, but I affirm that, however the very Name of Power may frighten the Vulgar, it will never be honoured by the Philosopher, or the Man of Sense, unless accompany'd with Dignity." External corroboration of Fielding's authorship of the letter is not lacking. A letter in *Common Sense* for October 21, 1738, refers to Fielding's use of the analogy of Ward's Pill as follows: "There was a Poet, whose little Pieces became the Delight of the Town, and gave Bread to a Company of Comedians at the little Theatre in the Haymarket: But Wit and Satire, as he himself observed, are like some Medicines, which will not operate upon sound Constitutions, but when they meet with a rotten Carcass, they play the Devil; and our Projector happening to have a great many sore Places about him, our Poet's Pills, gave him the Gripes." This shows that Fielding was at least supposed by a contemporary to be the author of the letter.

The reply which Fielding made to the argument of the "Adventurer in Politicks" against the bringing of politics on the stage was vigorous, and significantly cited Aristophanes as an example. He also defended himself from the assertion that by ridicule he was making light of grave evils, as Gay had turned highwaymen into heroes. He denied that Gay made heroes of his highwaymen, and asserted that "we do not always approve what we laugh at," citing Hobbes to the effect that "Laughter is a Sign of Contempt."

<sup>1</sup> See Keightley, *Fraser's Magazine*, February, 1858, p. 217, and G. E. Jensen's edition of the *Covent-Garden Journal* (Yale Univ. Press, 1915), I, 103.

Incidentally he gives us a glimpse of his idea of satire, which should ridicule without being bitter. "And by raising such a Laugh as this against Vice," he says, "Horace assures us we give a sorer Wound, than it receives from all the Abhorrence which can be produced by the gravest and bitterest Satire." It is a sensible and vigorous letter, and under its tone of raillery there is a decided tone of seriousness which points ahead to the Fielding of the *Covent-Garden Journal* and the *Champion*.

CHARLES W. NICHOLS.

*The University of Minnesota.*

---

#### REVIEWS

*Karl Gutzkow's Short Stories. A Study in the Technique of Narration.* By DANIEL FREDERICK PASMORE. Menasha, Wisconsin: George Banta Publishing Company, 1918. 122 pp., \$1.40.

Irgendeine Bibliographie, etwa Herm. Anders Krügers *Deutsches Literatur-Lexikon*, München 1914, enthält so wenig Literatur über Gutzkow, dass man sich wundern muss, warum eine ganze Reihe von Einzeluntersuchungen aus Gutzkows Gebiet nicht längst schon gegeben sind. Die deutsche Forschung behandelt Gutzkow noch immer stiefmütterlich. Houbens ausgedehnte und eindringliche Studien ermöglichen eine bessere Beurteilung von Dichter und Werk, aber selbst Houbens Forschung ist mehr eine umfassender Versuch als ein abschliessendes Werk. Nötige biographische und kritische Vorarbeiten fehlen noch dazu, was bei einem so fruchtbaren Schriftsteller wie Gutzkow doppelt schwer wiegt. Amerikanische Germanisten andererseits beschäftigen sich m. E. immer noch zu einseitig mit der klassischen Literatur des 18. Jahrhunderts und der Frühromantik; das deutsche 19. Jahrhundert endet vielen von ihnen—wie den meisten Professoren des Englischen—mit Heine. Seit einiger Zeit ist ein gewisses Interesse an der modernsten deutschen Literatur wahrzunehmen; aber es steht ohne gründliche wissenschaftliche Erkenntnis gerade der Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts auf schwachen Füßen. Es fehlen, wenn ich so sagen darf, die gesunden Bindeglieder zwischen Kuno Franckes wertvoller *History of German Literature* und Ludwig Lewisohns geistreicher Schrift *The Spirit of Modern German Literature*, die eben nach kaum zwei Jahren eine zweite Auflage erlebt hat.

Einem ernsten Studium und Verständnis Gutzkows wird hoffentlich die neue Zeit zugute kommen, die mit der deutschen Revolution von 1918 beginnt. In ihrem Lichte werden alle demokratischen Bewegungen im Deutschland hauptsächlich des 19. Jahrhunderts von neuem einzuschätzen sein. Von Jungdeutschland sind starke und anhaltende geistige und politische Mächte ausgegangen oder besser ins Werk gesetzt worden. Man braucht nur an die Forderungen der unbedingten politischen und religiösen Freiheit zu erinnern, an die Trennung von Staat und Kirche, den Aufschwung der Presse, die Demokratisierung des Bildungswesens und die Frauenemanzipation. Auch Gutzkow war ein "Doktor der Revolution" und mit Karl Marx, Ruge und eigentlich jedem einzelnen der berühmten Revolutionäre wohlbekannt. Nebenbei gesagt, auch mit dem deutsch-amerikanischen Sozialisten Weitling hat er Fühlung gehabt; W. F. Kamman in seiner interessanten Schrift *Socialism in German American Literature*, Philadelphia 1917, hat das leider nicht weiter beachtet. Gutzkow hat auch irgendwie Kunde von Amerikas Verfassung, Leben und sogar seiner Literatur gehabt. Auch das wäre der Untersuchung wert, vielleicht unter dem Gesamttitel "Die Jungdeutschen und Amerika," und könnte ein hübsches Gegenstück zu John Whytes *Young Germany in its Relations to Britain* bilden. Und wenn dieser Stoff auch nur einen Aufsatz füllte, so wäre das schon Förderung der Wissenschaft. Es muss ja nicht immer eine breitgetretene Doktordissertation sein.

Pasmore schreibt nun im Vorwort seiner Arbeit, er glaube "that there is a definite place for a critical survey of Karl Gutzkow's short stories" und hoffe "to draw some measure of attention to this writer's less comprehensive but still deserving efforts." In seinem Glauben und Hoffen ist er nicht fehlgegangen. Schon die Wahl des Gegenstandes ist zu loben. Die Arbeit selber empfiehlt sich durch verschiedenes. Sie will nicht einseitig und eng sein und gibt deshalb nicht nur eine kurze Lebensskizze Gutzkows und Besprechung seiner Stellung in der Literatur, sondern auch die jungdeutsche Bewegung und die Entwicklung der Theorie der Novelle bis 1835, schliesslich auf ein paar Seiten die literarischen Ansichten Gutzkows und sehr brauchbare Inhaltsangaben von 23 seiner Novellen. Die übrigen zwei Drittel des Buches gehören der mehr technischen Studie über Gutzkows Erzählungsweise.—Einige der Anfangskapitel sind zu knapp um gründlich oder auch nur ganz



klar zu sein. Im 2. Kapitel überrascht uns der Verfasser mit Paul Pfizers *Briefwechsel zweier Deutschen* ohne Datum usw. Da Paul Pfizer viel weniger bekannt und bedeutend ist als sein jüngerer Bruder Gustav, waren nähere Angaben sehr nötig. Es geht weiterhin nicht an, ihn einfach mit Wolfgang Menzel auf eine Stufe zu stellen (Pasmore, S. 17). Das 3. Kapitel ist unverzeihlich flüchtig: statt Stuttgart wird zweimal Strassburg gebraucht, Gutzkows Gefängnisstrafe ist zu kurz bemessen, und die Jahreszahlen verschiedener Werke stimmen nicht. Die fünfseitige Bibliographie am Ende ist unnötig breit und auch ungenau. Verdienstlich ist die Liste C, die wenigstens die meisten Schriften über deutsche Novellisten und ihre Technik verzeichnet.

Leider hat Pasmore seinem Gegenstand im ganzen eine weniger tiefe und gründliche Behandlung angedeihen lassen als der erlaubte, ja forderte. Die Unvollständigkeit des Materials erklärt allerdings ein gut Teil. Selbst die wichtigeren Schriften Gutzkows sind aus amerikanischen Universitätsbibliotheken nicht zu beschaffen. Mir persönlich stand zum Glück noch die Bostoner Public Library zur Verfügung, die ungefähr so viel wie die Congressional Library besitzt, was für wissenschaftliche Zwecke wenig genug ist. Nur Ausgaben von *Uriel Acosta* sind überall in Hülle und Fülle zu haben. Wenn die Besitzstände der amerikanischen öffentlichen und akademischen Büchereien einen Schluss erlauben, so ist es der, dass Gutzkow ungefähr wie Spielhagen ziemlich schlecht mit der amerikanischen Gunst gefahren ist. Warum, so frage ich mich bei beiden Schriftstellern vergebens.

Bleibt immer noch der Einwand, dass sich der Verfasser nicht gehörig mit dem Stand der Gutzkowforschung vertraut gemacht hat. Karl Rosenkranzens *Neue Studien* mit einem Aufsatz über Gutzkows *Ritter vom Geist* werden z. B. erwähnt; warum nicht auch der Aufsatz desselben Mannes aus seinen *Studien*, Fünfter Teil, Leipzig 1848, betitelt *Karl Gutzkow bis zu seinem dramatischen Auftreten* (1840)? Hier fand sich u. a. eine interessante Besprechung der 2 Bände *Novellen*, die 1834 in Hamburg, und der 2 Teile *Soireen*, die 1835 in Frankfurt a. M. erschienen. Auch Winke für eine Bewertung der Novellen waren vorhanden. Schon der Fund von Karl Gutzkows *Ausgewählten Novellen mit einer Einleitung von Rudolf von Gottschall*, in Reclams Universalbibliothek, Nr. 5079/80, hätte sich gelohnt, insofern als er dem Ver-



fasser einen anregenden Aufsatz über *Gutzkow als Epiker* vermittelt hätte. Und das führt mich zu meinem Haupteinspruch, dass nämlich die Novellen Gutzkows vom Verfasser ausser allem Zusammenhang mit seinem prosaischen Gesamtwerk betrachtet werden. Roman und Novelle hängen aber eng zusammen, und Gutzkow ist keine Ausnahme. Im Gegenteil, gerade bei ihm verlaufen die Grenzen zwischen beiden. *Die Diakonissin*, die er ein "Lebensbild" nennt und die in der Sonderausgabe, Frankfurt a.M. 1855, 223 Seiten umfasst, bedurfte nur einer grösseren Ausspinnung des Lebensschicksals einiger Personen, der Vertiefung von nur gestreiften Problemen und allgemein einer volleren Orts- und Menschenschilderung, um ein Weltbild zu werden und ein Roman zu heissen. *Seraphine* führt Pasmore selber als Roman auf, ohne sich genauer darüber auszulassen. Rosenkranz macht a.a.O. darauf aufmerksam, dass sich *Seraphine* bereits aus der sogenannten Bamboccia *Das Singekränzchen* entwickelt habe; ein Hinweis also darauf, dass bei Gutzkow aus einem kleinen skizzenhaften Gebilde so etwas wie ein ausgeführtes episches Werk entstehen kann. Die Möglichkeit ist die Hauptsache hierbei, nicht die Vollkommenheit der Ausführung. Man hat bei einem Romane Gutzkows, *Blasedow und seine Söhne* (1837) das umgekehrte Verfahren angewandt, nämlich eine Episode als "in sich völlig abgeschlossenes Genrebild" herausgenommen und unter dem Titel *Zwei Studenten der Zukunft* besonders veröffentlicht, und zwar in Ernst Ecksteins *Humoristischem Hausschatz fürs deutsche Volk*, 3. Band, Leipzig 1872. Dass der Verfasser einen Zusammenhang von Roman und Novelle geahnt hat, geht aus seiner Bemerkung auf der vorletzten Seite hervor; "They (i. e., the short stories) present in miniature the panorama which the author's larger novels present in full." Eine Ausmalung dieses Panoramas ist aber gerade was fehlt. Auch auf Seite 100 wird eine gute Beobachtung über den Unterschied von beiden gemacht und zwar vom Gesichtspunkt des "plot" aus. Hier könnte man ausserdem eine Bemerkung Eichendorffs notieren<sup>1</sup>; er spricht von der historischen Novelle, "die sich zum Romane etwa verhält, wie das Konversationsstück zur Tragödie, oder das Genrestück zur Historienmalerei."—Hierher gehört auch das "Verhältnis der Novelle zum Drama, was mir der Verfasser zu rasch abtut: aller-

<sup>1</sup> *Der deutsche Roman des 18. Jahrhunderts in seinem Verhältnis zum Christentum*, Leipzig 1851, S. 264.

dings hat er hierbei mehrere amerikanische Forscher hinter sich. Gutzkow sagt ausdrücklich (bei Pasmores, S. 29), die Erzählung sei ein "objektiv berichtetes Drama," und hat selbst zwei seiner wertvollsten Novellen dramatisiert. Es ist nicht zufällig, dass Gutzkow sich ganz ähnlich wie Paul Heyse oder Wilbrandt oder Marie von Ebner-Eschenbach, um nur ein paar Namen der deutschen Novellenkunst zu nennen, höchst erfolgreich im Drama betätigt hat. Nur Gottfried Keller, Storm und K. F. Meyer, in zweiter Linie auch Mörike, Stifter und Fontane, haben die Verbindung Lyrik und Novellistik rein aufzuweisen; doch haben selbst Keller und Fontane recht merkwürdige dramatische Anwendungen verspürt. Und umgekehrt liesse sich sagen, dass einige der bedeutendsten modernen deutschen Dramatiker auch echte Novellenkunst geschaffen haben, man denke an Kleist, Otto Ludwig, Anzengruber und Wildenbruch. Hier sind Beziehungen, die noch aufzudecken sind. Die deutsche Forschung scheint sich neuerdings dem Problem des Novellistischen von der Seite der Form genähert zu haben. Oskar Walzel verweist z. B. in seinem Heft *Die Künstlerische Form des Dichtwerks*, Berlin 1916, u.a. auf seinen Aufsatz "Die Kunstform der Novelle," der 1915 in der *Zeitschrift für deutschen Unterricht*, XXIX, 161 ff. erschienen, mir aber leider noch nicht zu Gesicht gekommen ist.

Das bringt mich zu Pasmores 1. Kapitel über die Theorie der Novelle. Es ist m.E. ganz falsch, mit ihm u.a. zu sagen, dass der deutsche Kritiker im Punkte Novelle "less severe in his demands" sei als der amerikanische bezüglich der *short story*. Natürlich darf man nicht einfach beide Begriffe gleichsetzen, aber aus anderen Gründen als der Verfasser meint. Mit dem Wort Novelle wird nämlich von vielen Dichtern und Kritikern leichtfertig umgegangen. Novelle kann alles bedeuten—genau wie *short story*; kann auch einfach mit Erzählung gleichgestellt werden, etwa wie früher Ballade und Romanze umschichtig gebraucht worden ist. Friedrich Lienhard, der Klassiker aus Deutsch-Elsass, nennt *Der Einsiedler und sein Volk* (1914) einen Band von Erzählungen, erklärt jedoch im Vorwort ausdrücklich "Novelle—wir verstehen darunter eine gedrängte, gut aufgebaute, sprachlich sorgfältig behandelte Geschichte, die gleichsam in einem Brennpunkt ein ganzes Lebensschicksal zusammenfasst." Aber bei den grossen und echten Novellenschreibern Deutschlands ist Novelle eine ganz bestimmte Kunst-

form. Ein grosszügiger Kritiker der Literatur wie Walzel nimmt seine Normen nur aus literarischen Mustern. Auch das ernste Suchen der deutschen Novellisten nach einem klaren Begriff, wenn auch nicht immer nach einer sogenannten Theorie der Novelle unterstützt meine Behauptung. In Amerika haben sich nur Poe und Bret Harte, die beide stark von Deutschland beeinflusst waren, zur *short story* geäussert.—Pasmore wiederholt nur, was zahlreiche Amerikanisten hierzulande behaupten. So nimmt Pattee in seiner *History of American Literature since 1870*, 1915 erschienen, ziemlich kritiklos an, dass "the brevity of form" einfach "an excellence of workmanship" ergibt. Aber "literature in parcels" macht an sich weder die *short story* noch die Novelle aus. Ich weise hierauf nur hin, weil Pasmore in diesem Zusammenhang allein sieben englische Werke namentlich aufführt. Uebrigens bereits in Robert McBurney Mitchells verdienstvoller Dissertation *Heyse and His Predecessors in the Theory of the Novelle* (1915) wird Brander Matthews auf Seite 73 Anm. 2 korrigiert.

Für die geschichtliche Darstellung der Novellentheorie vor Gutzkow fusst Pasmore grossenteils auf Mitchells bekannten Studien. Eine bessere Kenntnis der deutschen Novellenliteratur hätte ihn von Mitchell etwas weniger abhängig gemacht. In einem Punkte hat er sich lobenswert selbständig gezeigt, dass er am lebendigen Beispiel Gutzkow nicht so sehr die Theorie der Novelle betrachtet hat als vielmehr die Leistung des Novellisten. Die Novellen selber verraten oft viel besser als der Novellenschreiber, wie eine gute Novelle aussehen muss oder was er sich darunter vorstellt. Bezeichnend bleibt immerhin, dass Gutzkow selbst so verschiedene Bezeichnungen gebraucht, wie Bambocciade, Skizze, Erzählung, Lebensbild, Novelle, kleiner Roman und Roman. Ich habe immer gefunden, dass Mitchell z. B. den geschwätzigen Theoretiker Mundt überschätzt, während er dem grossen Meister Storm nicht genug Wert beilegt; deshalb stimme ich hierin und im ganzen mit John Lees überein, der in der *Modern Language Review* vom Juli 1918 Mitchell vorwirft, er stütze sich zu einseitig auf Heyse. Für Pasmore ergab sich die Gelegenheit, Mitchells Ausführungen über Jungdeutschland zu vervollständigen und zwar durch Gutzkows literarische Theorie und Praxis. Für die Wandlung der Anschauungen Gutzkows vom Roman wäre noch seine Kritik *Ein Roman von Rudolf Gottschall*, aus der Sammlung *In bunter Reihe, Briefe*,

*Skizzen, Novellen*, Berlin 1878, von Wert gewesen. Danach wäre der Roman, es war 1876 oder 77, kaum mehr für "ideelle Bestrebungen" zu wählen; der deutsche Roman sei der wahre Münchhausen zu Wasser und zu Lande geworden . . . der "ausgetretene Schlappschuh der Muse des Tages."

Pasmore benützt als eine der Hauptquellen der Gutzkowschen Theorie das Buch von 1868 *Vom Baum der Erkenntnis*, übergeht aber ausgerechnet die wichtige zusammenfassende Stelle auf Seite 211: "Wer Novellen schreiben will, muss zunächst die Anschauung irgend einer anekdotisch auffallenden Widersinnigkeit haben, einer erschütternden Zufallsbegegnung im ernstesten Genre, einer anmutig komischen im heitern. Um dies Faktum herum ist dann der Faden der Entwicklung anzulegen und das im Zusammenhang Sinnige aus dem vereinzelt Widersinnigen einschmeichelnd und überzeugend darzustellen. Ohne Zweifel hat Tieck seine Novellen so gearbeitet." Das verursacht schiefe Auffassungen über Gutzkows literarische Ansichten wie über sein Verhältnis zu Tieck dem Novellenschreiber. B. Riefferts Dissertation, Münster 1908, über Gutzkows Stellung zur Romantik hätte dem Verfasser mehr geben sollen als einen Platz in der Bücherliste, vor allem die Ueberzeugung, dass Gutzkow keineswegs "bitterly opposed to Romanticism" (Pasmore, S. 29) war; auch das Urteil des Verfassers auf Seite 116: "The influence of the Romanticists upon Gutzkow is slight," etc. ist falsch. Rieffert bringt schwerwiegende Belege für Gutzkows schönes Verständnis für Eichendorff und Uhland. Die zwei Anführungen aus *Beiträge zur Geschichte der neuesten Literatur*, Stuttgart 1839, und dem Sammelwerk *In bunter Reihe*, die erste über Eichendorff, die zweite über den "Zauber der Romantik" hätten sich Pasmore, S. 25 sehr gut angeschlossen, vorzüglich im Punkte der dort erwähnten Dreiteilung der Literatur. Die Eichendorff-Stufe vereinigte für Gutzkow die epische oder Goethesche mit der romantischen oder subjektiven. Deshalb wollte er damals Eichendorff nachfolgen, wie er es später und in anderer Weise bei dem Novellisten Tieck tat. Am Ende seines Lebens und Schaffens stellte er sich die dritte Stufe oder die Moderne (mit dem Gedanken) als eine Ueberwindung vor, des Antiken (mit dem Opfer) und des Romantischen (mit dem Wunder). Ein paar Worte mehr hinsichtlich Gutzkows theoretischer Stellung zur Romantik. In einem von Rieffert und Pasmore übersehenen frühen Aufsatz vom Jahre 1837

über W. Schadow, der in den *Oeffentlichen Charakteren* steht, wendet sich Gutzkow gegen "die romantische Frazze" und gegen "eine gewisse spielende Bedeutsamkeit des Unbedeutenden." Wir Modernen stimmen ganz mit ihm darin überein. In den *Vermittelungen*, Leipzig 1842, traut er dann dem "Gemüt der Romantiker" nicht, ohne sich doch so glattweg verständnislos anzustellen wie P. E. More in *The Drift of Romanticism* (1913). Die Romantik als Zeiterscheinung und einzelne Romantiker wie Tieck überwindet er, wie es die Geister des 19. Jahrhunderts getan haben, z.B. Ludwig und Hebbel. Auszeichnend ist nur des jüngeren Gutzkows oft unglücklicher Krakehlton. Das Romantische geht ihm wie Ludwig allmählich im Begriff des poetischen Realismus ein und unter. Schon im *Baum der Erkenntnis*, S. 215 f., werden Idealismus und Realismus gegenübergestellt, und Gutzkow sagt: "Idealisieren darf der Künstler, aber er darf es nur in so weit, als dadurch dem Realen kein Abbruch geschieht in dem, was für seine Wesenheit notwendig ist." Und in seinem allerletzten theoretischen Werk *In bunter Reihe*, S. 41, wird der Gegensatz von Idealismus und Realismus "ein besonders bezeichnender für die neuere deutsche Literatur" genannt; fast genau wie Otto Ludwig erkennt er, "dass beide Weisen, die reale und ideale ohne einander nicht bestehen können." So viel über die allgemeine "Theorie" Gutzkows, die beweist, welch wichtiges Bindeglied er darstellt von der Romantik über Jungdeutschland zum poetischen Realismus um die Jahrhundertmitte.

Eichendorff in der erwähnten Stelle seiner Schrift über den Roman unterscheidet hauptsächlich zwei Arten von modernen Novellen: die Maler- und Reisenovelle und die politische, und stellt dabei einen allgemeinen Rückzug vom Romantischen fest. Als neueste Novellen nennt er Tiecks "Zwecknovellen," die oft nur dialogisierte Kunstkritiken wären. Anknüpfend hieran möchte ich verschiedene Novellen Gutzkows als dialogisierte Feuilletons bezeichnen, Charakterstudien, wie er sie z.B. in seinen *Oeffentlichen Charakteren* sehr eigenartig anstellte. In der Vorrede zur 1. Auflage dieser Schrift (1835) schreibt er: "Nur Menschen wollt ich schildern, bei denen sich nichts verstecken durfte und bei denen das Nebendetail der Privatverhältnisse so unbedeutend ist, dass sie nicht vermisst werden." Nicht viel anders verfährt er mit seinen Zeitgeschichtlichen Novellen, z.B. *Die Diakonissin*, *Die Nihilisten*



oder *Die Selbsttaufe*. Alle entsprechen den Leitsätzen aus dem Essay *Die Napoleoniden*: "Das Schauspiel unserer Tage hat sich vor überreicher Handlung in ein Epos verwandelt, so dass der Historiker weniger Epochen als Zustände zu schildern hat, breite Dimensionen, breite Antworten nicht mehr auf die Frage: Was geschah? sondern: Wie wurde gelebt?" Gutzkows Ansicht von der Zeitgeschichte stimmt also mit seiner literarischen Forderung überein. Seine Auffassung der zeitgenössischen Geschichte erklärt die der Geschichte überhaupt. Der "öffentliche Charakter" findet sich auch in seinen historischen Novellen *Jean Jacques* und *König Franz in Fontainebleau* wieder. Man könnte beinahe von einer echtromantischen Auffassung der Geschichte sprechen, wenn es *In bunter Reihe*, S. 45, heisst: "Die Geschichte ist das grösste Gedicht." Gutzkows allerletzte Geschichte *Der Werwolf* ist eine historische Novelle mit manchem Reiz.

Reifferts Schrift enttäuschte hauptsächlich in dem letzten Abschnitt "Spuren der Romantik in Gutzkows Werken," worin er den Einfluss Tieckscher Novellendichtung ebenso wie den Jean Pauls nur "erwähnt." "Dass man abgesehen von den Schriften jener Jugendperiode von 1830-35 bei Gutzkow nach besonderen literarischen Einflüssen durch die Werke der Romantiker nicht zu suchen braucht," das "glaubt" Reiffert nur, weil er Gutzkows Novellen und Romane nicht kennt. Und leider ist auch Pasmore dem nicht weiter nachgegangen. Bei der Erörterung der verschiedenen Novellenmotive fällt ein Wort hier und da über E. T. A. Hoffmann, das ist alles.

Eine bestimmte Beeinflussung durch Tieck, auf die ich hier nicht näher eingehen will, ist von Gutzkow selbst anerkannt und auch schon von Rosenkranz zeitig bemerkt worden. Die Zeitgenossen haben "die Tiecksche Manier" gesehen. Karl Frenzel schrieb später in seinem Nachruf auf Gutzkow, in *Erinnerungen und Strömungen*, Leipzig 1890: "Nicht nur an künstlerischer Geschlossenheit, auch an Wahrheit der Charakteristik wurden sie (d. i. Gutzkows Erzählungen) von der Tieckschen Novelle übertroffen. Gutzkow war noch viel zu sehr im Monolog befangen, ein unausgetragener Lyriker, um objektiv eine Begebenheit erzählen zu können." Von Tieck-Bernhardi stammt der Ausdruck *Bambocciade*, d. i. nach Rudolph Haym launiges, satirisches Gemälde aus der Sphäre des alltäglichen Lebens. Gutzkow hat verschiedene



der Art geschrieben, z.B. *Das Singekränzchen* und die Geschichte vom Kanarienvogel, die freilich bitterer ist als Tiecks Schnurren. Von Tieck stammt auch die Vorliebe nicht nur für Literaturdramen, sondern auch für Literaturnovellen, von denen ausser *Jean Jacques* und *Das Johannisfeuer* noch zwei interessante Kleinigkeiten aus *In bunter Reihe* zu nennen wären: *Vor Freude sterben. Ein Literaturbild*, und *Um eine Rose* mit dem ausdrücklichen Titel "Literaturnovelle." Von dem Helden der zuletzt genannten Geschichte heisst es ironisch: "Ich schildere ihn vollständig im Gegensatz zu den Romanen und Bühnenstücken der Jetztzeit." Ganz Tieck! Rosenkranz erwähnte übrigens schon *Geständnisse einer alten Perrücke* als literarische Parodie auf Rumohrs *Denkwürdigkeiten*. Gutzkows allererste Novelle *Der Prinz von Madagaskar* ist, was Pasmore u. a. merkwürdigerweise entgangen ist, nicht nur eine ganz lebendige abenteuerliche Geschichte, sondern auch eine köstliche Ironie, eine romantische anti-romantische Parodie auf die Abenteurergeschichte, wie sie die Romantiker pflegten und wie man sie etwa heutzutage und hierzulande im *Movie* finden kann. Der Kontrast der Kulturen ("Was ist Afrika gegen Paris"!), den Pasmore, S. 46, recht erkennt, ist dem ironischen Plan durchaus untergeordnet; die Ausdeutung des ganzen als einer politischen Satire auf Metternich halte ich für zu weit hergeholt. Nur eine paar Belege für meine Auffassung. Als der Held ungefähr am Spiess steckt, heisst es: "Er ging von seiner eigenen Lage ganz ab und fragte sich, ob er die Filibustier oder die Naturwilden Coopers oder die Kannibalen Eugen Sues oder wohl gar die frommen katholischen Indianer Chateaubriands vor sich habe? Er dachte sich immer, wie sich sein Schicksal jetzt gedruckt lesen würde." Oder: "Hippolyt hatte eine Uebersetzung des deutschen Hoffmann gelesen und glaubte an die blauen Weingespenster des preussischen Kammergerichtsrats, er blieb stehen und fragte den nächsten Baum, ob sich vielleicht jemand hinter ihm versteckt hätte." Die wilde Madagassin spricht "wie Chateaubriand schreibt." Als der Prinz auf die verwahrloste französische Insel St. Marie kommt, meint er: "Ganz wie bei Scribe!" Und so fort bis zu des Helden Stosseufzer: "Es scheint, als sei ich bestimmt, ein Opfer der Romantik zu werden." Es klingt manchmal wie die novellistische Erläuterung zu Gutzkows Studie über Chateaubriand, den "Don Quichote des Christentums" und

einen der besten der öffentlichen Charaktere Gutzkows. Es ist auf alle Fälle mehr als eine Geschichte mit "satirical tendency," oder "a satire upon the culture of the Europeans," wie Pasmore meint (S. 62; 92).

Pasmores Beitrag zur Technik der Novelle bei Gutzkow ist reich an Einzelheiten, die man aber gelegentlich mehr psychologisch aufgefasst und geschichtlich ausgedeutet wissen möchte. Eine an sich richtige Beobachtung vom "contrast between the genuine and the false" (S. 80) gewinnt erst Leben, wenn dabei die Aufmerksamkeit auf das Motiv vom Schein und Sein gelenkt wird, das in der deutschen Literatur seit den Klassikern eine grosse Rolle spielt. Beim *Emporblick*, dessen kunstvolle Beschreibung vom Verfasser verständnisvoll bemerkt wird, lag ein Hinweis auf das Milieu von Hebbels *Maria Magdalena* nahe. Die Bemerkung über die *Wellenbraut* (S. 50), dass darin ein neues Motiv des Klassenkampfes zu finden wäre, ist leider unrichtig. Theobald gehört nicht zur "bürgerlichen Klasse," im Gegenteil sagt er von sich selbst: "Ich habe einen glänzenden alten Namen, der mich drückt, weil ich arm bin." Diesem Namen zuliebe werden ihm sogar die Jahre, die er im Gefängnis wegen Demagogie zubrachte, vergeben. Das reine Problem der Novelle ist Liebe und Ehe, alles andere dient nur zur Staffage. Das "Nebeneinander" darf nicht überschätzt werden, wenn man Gutzkows episches Verdienst festsetzt. Mehr als ein einzelnes formales Moment kann es besten Falls nicht sein, besonders wenn seine Vorgeschichte erwogen wird. Selbst wo Gutzkow den Roman des Nebeneinander sehr interessant behandelt, nämlich in *Vom Baum der Erkenntnis*, S. 213 f., betont er, dass alles auf die Anschauung ankomme, der Dichter ein Seher sein müsse usw. Auch hier liegt ein Gedanke der Romantik zu Grunde. Endlich wenn Pasmore (S. 100; 116) vom Realisten Gutzkow spricht, darf er die nötige Einschränkung nicht vergessen. Wir hören gern, dass Gutzkow sachlich zu erzählen weiss; auch hier wäre der historische Hinweis am Platze, dass uns diese Erzählungsart und dieser Stil genau wie bei Freytag u. a. heute schon etwas altertümlich klingt. Auch das sachliche Erzählen hat eine Geschichte. Das mit der Tendenz bei Gutzkow ist gleichfalls lange nicht so schlimm, wie es uns oberflächliche Literaturgeschichten vorgeredet haben. Pasmores Beobachtung, dass Gutzkow Dialekt fast gar nicht verwendet, macht die Ergänzung nötig, dass eben dieser

Umstand für eine geringe Volkstümlichkeit im Ausdruck spricht. Gutzkow ist Städter durch und durch, dessen Berührung mit dem Volk sich auf die städtischen Massen beschränkt, woraus sich wohl der fast unglaubliche Satz aus *In bunter Reihe*, S. 94, erklärt: "Fritz Reuter und die, die ihn mögen, erinnern mich immer an Hausknechte." Zur Einschränkung des Realismus gehört auch, dass Gutzkow wenn auch nicht eigentlich lyrisch, so doch poetisch sein konnte. Und er wollte es sein, wie er bereits in den *Vermittelungen. Kritiken und Charakteristiken*, Leipzig 1842, S. 259, bekennt: "Dichter sind wir alle, wenn wir den Lockungen des Genius folgen, wenn wir auch nicht Beiträge in den Musenalmanach schicken." Pasmores Behauptung (S. 116), dass Gutzkows Werke "firmly grounded upon a modern view of life" seien, ist nur mit Vorbehalt anzunehmen. Die ganze reife Novelle *Eine Phantasieliebe* (1845) widerspricht dem mit ihrer poetischen Zartheit, ihrer neuromantischen Verträumtheit und einer Natursymbolik, die an Novalis denken lässt. Und eine Darstellung seiner Anschauung über Liebe und Ehe würde alles noch klarer machen. Wenn Gutzkow wirklicher Erzähler und Künstler ist, erscheint er als poetischer Realist.

F. SCHOENEMANN.

Harvard University.

---

*The Covent-Garden Journal.* By Sir Alexander Drawcansir (Henry Fielding). Edited by Gerard Edward Jensen. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1915. Two volumes.

*The Tragedy of Tragedies.* By Henry Fielding. Edited by James T. Hillhouse. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1918.

*The History of Henry Fielding.* By Wilbur L. Cross. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1918. Three volumes.

Yale, which long since took Ben Jonson to her bosom and has done him honor in an impressive series of volumes, has in these latter days been intertwining her fame in like manner with that of Henry Fielding. The useful and well edited reprints put forth by Dr. Jensen and Dr. Hillhouse are a sort of prelude to the altogether admirable biography by Professor Cross. The magnificent Fielding collection in the university library, in large part the gift

of Mr. F. S. Dickson, must have acted as an incentive to research in this subject, but the best stimulus was doubtless the enthusiastic, patient, penetrative learning of the author of *The Life and Times of Laurence Sterne* from whom the world of English scholarship rightly expected a masterly account of the character and career of the greatest of English novelists. That expectation the biography more than fulfils.

Dr. Jensen's edition of Fielding's contributions to *The Covent-Garden Journal* (which includes also some articles by Fielding's associates in that enterprise) appeared sufficiently long ago for it to be known well and favorably at present; and therefore does not require detailed notice here. The introduction deals exhaustively, if dryly, with the circumstances of the founding and conduct of the *Journal*, the connection of the enterprise with Fielding's work in the sphere of social reform, the events and personalities of the "Battle of the Wits," the characteristics of Fielding's style in his leaders (I cannot but think that Dr. Jensen's estimation of the general level of excellence in these papers is too high), and the criteria by which Fielding's contributions can be identified with reasonable certainty. For the general reader the paralled chapters in Dr. Cross' biography will prove more entertaining. Indeed, strange to say, much of the interest and all the charm of Dr. Jensen's volumes are found in a most unlikely place—the notes. The care with which Fielding's personal, political and literary allusions have been run to earth nominates Dr. Jensen for the position of editor of the fully annotated edition of the novels which some day we must have. Professor Saintsbury once remarked in this connection:

"Such things, in the case of prose fiction, are of very doubtful use, and supply pretty certain stumbling-blocks to enjoyment; while in the particular case of Fielding, the annotation, unless extremely capricious, would have to be disgustingly full. Far be it at any rate from the present editor to bury these delightful creations under an ugly crust of parallel passages and miscellaneous erudition."

Dr. Jensen's notes to the novels (if we may judge by the commentary upon the *Journal*) would be full but neither disgusting nor ugly. The publication of such an edition would be the final stage in the vindication of Fielding from the malice of his enemies and the ignorance and prejudice of his earlier biographers. The *Journal*

contributes towards that vindication additional evidence of the learning, industry, rightmindedness and public spirit of this great man.

Within a narrower field similar evidence of his learning and industry is afforded by Dr. Hillhouse's edition of *The Tragedy of Tragedies* in which both versions of the burlesque that usually goes under that title are reprinted, with a brief but sufficient introduction and with notes that prove the tirelessness with which Fielding must have worked upon even this comparatively unimportant production. The long life of *Tom Thumb* upon the stage, especially in the version of O'Hara, is well reviewed.

But these two books are, so to speak, *hors d'œuvres*; the *pièce de résistance* is Dean Cross' *History* which I think it is not too much to say is a masterpiece of biographical writing. Patient research through the journals and pamphlets of the period and investigations in Salisbury and elsewhere have brought to light many new details of Fielding's life, details of authorship and dates and circumstances of publication, of his financial condition at various times in his career, of his connection with people of all sorts, of his arduous labor in the public welfare, and most especially of his character and reputation. For more than a century the fame of Fielding has been clouded by "the shadow of Arthur Murphy." Scott and Thackeray, Lowell and Leslie Stephen, among many others scarcely less famous, have misjudged him. Mr. Dobson did much to clear his fame but he too worked under the shadow. The reckless and brilliant essay of W. E. Henley really tended to confirm, perhaps unintentionally, the popular view of Fielding as a roisterer of genius, a spendthrift of ill-repute, often under arrest for debt, often drunk, generally in bad company, who dashed off his masterpieces while recovering from the effects of his frequent debauches. Rebellion against this view of the man has been perhaps more rife in recent years that Dean Cross seems to indicate. May I quote part of a summary in my own lecture notes on Fielding, made some time ago?

"In youth, strong, full-blooded, reckless, manly; excesses much exaggerated by contemporary opponents and posthumous tradition. Brave, generous, sympathetic, sincere. Laborious manhood in public service. Devoted husband and father, ardent friend, conscientious magistrate. Clear-sighted; against cant; anti-sentimentalist. Depictor and satirist of life, not expounder of a *theory* of life.



Indulgent to human frailties; keen enemy of meanness, hypocrisy, and self-deceit."

The portrait of Fielding that Dean Cross has drawn at full length will not be viewed with surprise by those of us who have held such opinions of the man as are outlined in this note; but it will be welcomed as containing all the proofs necessary for the complete establishment of that view. So many and so great were the errors in earlier accounts of Fielding's life that Dean Cross wisely made no attempt to give references to them and to check up their errors as he went along; but told his story as though he were the first in the field and reserved his comments upon his predecessors for his final chapters. These chapters, on "The Fame of Fielding" form an interesting example of a subject of research that is beginning to be much inquired into: the contemporary and posthumous reputation of great authors. Limits of space, despite the generous length of the work, probably prevented more detailed references to such purely aesthetic criticism as that of Mr. Saintsbury; a sentence might have been devoted to Mr. Harold Child's chapter in the *Cambridge History of English Literature*, and another sentence to Mr. Chesterton's brief but thoroughly sound essay on "Tom Jones and Morality." It is surprising that the review of Fielding's biographers gives no summary of Miss Godden's recent biography, a book that is often referred to in the course of the work.

For Dean Cross' studies of the various novels there can be nothing but praise; equally excellent are his accounts of Fielding's work in the drama, in journalism, and as Westminster magistrate. I do feel that he places too high an estimate upon the value of the plays; I think that there is little likelihood of their being more read in the future than in the past—but that is a small point. So complete and so exact is the work that I have found but one matter upon which it would be interesting to have more light cast. What is the connection between Fielding's "Dialogue between the Devil, the Pope, and the Pretender" and the anonymous "Dialogue between the Devil and George II" which is probably by George Halkett?<sup>1</sup> In no captious mood but to indicate by a solitary exception the general accuracy of Dean Cross' work one may call

<sup>1</sup> See vol. II, p. 15 f., and cf. *Cambridge History of English Literature*, vol. IX, p. 415.



attention to some confusion in the account of the printing of the various volumes of *Amelia*.<sup>2</sup> The proof-reading is almost perfect;<sup>3</sup> the illustrations well-chosen and exquisitely reproduced; the extensive bibliography itself a testimony to the greatness of Fielding's fame.

And yet how will this truly great work be received? With quiet satisfaction by scholars, doubtless; but, since it rescues and does not ruin a reputation, with little general comment and no excitement. I am sure that such a reception will satisfy Professor Cross. He is the last to seek notoriety such as has been won recently by the brilliantly perverse author of *Eminent Victorians*. It is better to work quietly towards the refurbishing of an unjustly tarnished fame than to damn reputations in epigram.

SAMUEL C. CHEW.

*Bryn Mawr College.*

---

*The Place-Names of Cumberland and Westmorland.* By W. J. SEDGEFIELD. Manchester, England, 1915. Pp. xlv, 208. [Publications of the University of Manchester. English Series, No. VII.]

The counties of Cumberland and Westmorland in northwestern England correspond roughly to the ancient Cumbria. It is a region where the three national elements, Angles, Norsemen, and Celt, came in closer contact than perhaps anywhere else in England. And as elsewhere, so here, it was evidently only the English and the Norse that mixed and fused and left numerous evidences of that fusion, whereas the Celt disappeared, leaving but few traces behind. Before the seventh century Cumbria must have been almost purely Celtic; through the seventh and the ninth centuries Angles came and settled, but what proportion of the population the two races made up in the eighth century we cannot tell. In the last quarter of the ninth century Danish visits are recorded; from about 900 the permanent Norse settlements begin. In 945 King

<sup>2</sup> See vol. II, p. 304, and cf. p. 308.

<sup>3</sup> Vol. I, p. 113, second note: For "Cook" read "Cooke"; vol. II, p. 325, middle of page: For "Goss" read "Gosse." Let these two corrections be considered evidence of the delight with which the reviewer has read the book, including notes and bibliography.

Eadmund of the West-Saxons devastated and conquered Cumbria and gave it to Malcolm II of Scotland to govern as a fief of the English crown. However, Malcolm's rule was evidently only nominal, for about the middle of the century the Norse were the actual rulers.<sup>1</sup> They had ceased to come as marauders and had for some time come as peaceful settlers. And for perhaps 150 years they continued to come as peaceful settlers. And the settlement of the English, which was begun earlier, also continued and grew. By the close of the eleventh century we can assume the Anglo-Norse settlement was complete, and the fusion of Angles and Norsemen well under way; the racial and linguistic foundations of the modern counties of Cumberland and Westmorland had been definitely and finally laid. The incorporation of the region into the Kingdom of England was accomplished in 1091 when Cumbria became a part of the Kingdom of England and William Rufus drove its ruler Dolfin<sup>2</sup> out of the town of Carlisle, although he did not take actual possession until 1092.<sup>3</sup> A few years later the two counties of Cumberland and Westmorland were formed about as at present by the division of the old Kingdom of Cumbria. And of the Celt? The evidence of the dialects and the place-names alike would seem to show that as the Norsemen came in in steadily larger numbers and as the English gained the ascendancy the Celt for the most part went elsewhere. Carlisle, Derwent, and Penrith are among the few Kymric names.

In the Introduction the author of the present investigation deals briefly with the historical background of the problem, the conditions under which the mixed language arose, the character of the place-names, the Anglo-Saxon and the Scandinavian element, the distribution of the several endings, the words represented in the names, and finally the personal names entering into the place-names. There is a good bibliography, and a helpful index, but a very short phonology, the whole vast material being dealt with very inadequately, of course, in the page and a half given to it. This omission I must regard as a defect, for the reader should have put before him the phonological laws by which the author establishes the equivalence set up between the place-name and the

<sup>1</sup> Sedgefield, Introduction, p. xi.

<sup>2</sup> Dolfin = ON. *Dólgfinnr*.

<sup>3</sup> J. E. Marr, *Cumberland*, 1910, p. 2.

elements that are offered as their source. In spite of this, however, the investigation is a valuable one, and will occupy a worthy place by the side of the many contributions to the study of English place-names that have appeared in recent years.<sup>4</sup> I shall not go into the etymologies as a whole, but I would like briefly to consider certain points, touching mainly method and criteria of loan.

While it is a rather simple matter to eliminate the few Celtic names, the problem of the provenance of the Anglo-Northern names is a tremendously complicated one. One starts out with the difficulty of the similarity of Old English and Old Scandinavian as regards form of the words involved; they are very often nearly alike, and they are often identical in form. As examples of the first kind I may give: OE. *æsc*, ON. *askr*; OE. *dæl*, ON. *dalr*; OE. *fleot*, ON. *fljót*; OE. *stede*, ON. *staðr*. Examples of the second kind: OE. *clif*, ON. *klif*; OE. *hlǣ*, ON. *hlǣ*; OE. *hus*, ON. *hus*; OE. *land*, ON. *land*; OE. *sand*, ON. *sandr*; OE. *tun*, ON. *tun*. The author well illustrates this himself in the table on p. xvi. However, the table takes into account only the classical West-Saxon forms, and I fail to find elsewhere in the Introduction or in the etymological discussions any formulation of those significant characteristics of Northern Late Old English which must be taken into account when considering certain groups of words. He does indeed discuss in the Introduction a hypothetical English-Norse language of the eleventh and twelfth centuries in which period many of the names originated. But this consideration touches only the problems of vocabulary, inflexions, and the leveling of endings, not the pronunciation. For instance, the author would seem to relate all cases of words in *-a-*, *-ai-*, or *-ay-* (pronounced *ē*) to the ON. words in *-ei-* (*æi*), and not to the OE. word in *ā*; among such words are: *ain*, *aik*, *braid* or *braith*, *stane* or *stain*. But all such forms may as well be from OE. as from ON.,

<sup>4</sup>Of these the most recent ones are: H. Lindkvist, *Middle English Place-names of Scandinavian Origin*, Upsala, 1912; W. H. Duignan, *Worcestershire Place-Names*, Oxford, 1912; H. Alexander, *The Place-Names of Oxfordshire*, Oxford, 1912; A. Goodall, *Place-Names of Southwest Yorkshire*, Cambridge, 1913; J. A. Sephton, *A Handbook of Lancashire Place-Names*, Liverpool, 1913; H. Mutschmann, *The Place-Names of Nottinghamshire*, Cambridge, 1913; W. St. C. Baddely, *Place-Names of Gloucestershire*, Gloucester, 1913; B. Walker, *The Place-Names of Derbyshire*, Derby, 1914-1915; R. G. Roberts, *The Place-Names of Sussex*, Cambridge, 1914.

when names of Northwestern England are considered. This whole question has, of course, been discussed elsewhere, and I need not go into it again.<sup>5</sup> But I call attention to it because this important feature of Northern Old English affects a considerable number of the names here under consideration. I may note one small group: the names *Aikhead*, near Wigton, *Aikshaw*, sw. of Abbey Town, *Aikton*, n. of Wigton, and *Aiketgate*, near Armathwaite. Were these places settled by Angles or Norsemen? Unless we have conclusive old records there must always be some uncertainty about this class of names. From the material at hand we should have to say that *Aikshaw* is English, for *-shaw* certainly is; hence the OE. source would be *ācsceaga*. *Aiketgate* seems to be Norse, for both the first and the last component part is Norse; however, the only form offered is the modern one. In the case of *Aikton*, the name seems to be Norse; the forms *Aykton*, 1231, and *Ayketon*, 1237, would seem to favor this, but the spelling *Ecton* in the *Doomesday Book* complicates it. Norse influence upon an originally English name seems not unlikely here. Other cases that are uncertain are: *Ennerdale*, *Braystones*, *Stainburn*, *Stainton* in Cumberland and *Stainmore* in Westmorland (early reference *Stanmoir*, year 980). Perfectly clear, however, is *Annaside*, earlier *Aynerset*, ON. *Einars-sætr*.

Since undoubtedly the proportion of English names was larger (possibly much larger) than the Scandinavian, it is somewhat surprising that Scandinavian words entering into the place-names of the two counties are more than twice as numerous as the English words. The Scandinavians used a greater variety of words in the formation of place-names, while the English were more in the habit of employing well-established 'stock' words. As to the actual proportion of names, the author's lists would seem to show a somewhat larger number to be Scandinavian than English. However, as indicated above, a group of the names that are assigned to the Scandinavian side could as well be English.

It would seem, also, that certain Scandinavian endings became the fashion and were resorted to by both Scandinavians and English. In such cases, then, the ending is no longer a test of the

<sup>5</sup> A summary of the problem may be found in the *Saga-Book of the Viking Club*, London, 1911, article "Norse Elements in English Dialects," pp. 1-18, by George T. Flom.

nationality of the settler. Such an ending is perhaps especially *-by*, which has wider range than other Scandinavian endings and is especially frequent in certain regions; it often passes beyond the boundaries of the Scandinavian settlement as marked out by the general character of the names. In the list of Cumberland names I find the following ending in *-by*,—names of places of apparently English settlers: *Allonby*, *Birkby*, *Botcherby*, *Ellonby*, *Etterby*, *Glassonby*, *Gutterby*, *Motherby* (*Modhere*), *Robberby*, (*Hrod-beorhtby*), *Wiggonby*. Several are Norman in form, as pointed out by the author: *Aglionby*, and *Ponsonby*, while *Flimby*, older *Flemingby*, and *Scotby* are both named after the nationality of the settler. This extension in the use of the ending *-by* also makes doubtful such names as *Asby* (OE. *Aesc* or ON. *Ask*?) and *Crossby*.

English place-names (and personal names) in all parts of England, but especially in the North, suffered many changes by the loss of a consonant in consonant groups, by weakening of endings, etc., in the eleventh to the fourteenth century. While changes of this kind are especially characteristic of regions where two languages meet and become fused, the first one, that of the reduction of consonant groups, may be in a more direct way due to Norse influence. In West-Scandinavian the tendency is for the middle consonant to disappear; the law will be found formulated in Noreen's *Altnordische Grammatik* I, § 281. It would be worth while to examine the extent of such reductions in Northern English names. I shall here merely note that the fact affects the question of the derivation of some of the names. For example, the name *Arkleside* in North Riding, Yorkshire, may contain the ODan. *Arkil* rather than the ON. *Arnketell*, for in North Riding there were a great many more Danes than Norsemen. But the name *Arkleton* in Dumfriesshire, Scotland, is probably rather to be referred to the ON. form (*Arnkl* > *Arkl*). And the name *Arkleby*, near *Aspatia* in Cumberland, is certainly most likely to have been the place of a Norse settler. Contraction of the second element *-ketell* to *-kell* was of course common enough in Norway and Iceland, and does not particularly distinguish Danish from Norse. Such reductions probably nearly all took place on English soil among Danes, Norsemen, and English alike, and some of them are very late, as e. g., *Corby*, which in forms of 1120 and 1167

\* Pp. 1 and 88.



appears as *Chorkeby* and *Corcheby*, and as *Corckby* as late as 1572. In Westmorland the consonant group *-skb-* has become *-sb-* in *Asby*, but in *Askham* the *k* remains, of course. In Cumberland the name *Ascpatric*, date 1230, shows a form *Aspatric* for the year 1233. Thus the reduced form is that of actual speech already then and the one with *-c-* represents a conservative spelling.

GEORGE T. FLOM.

University of Illinois.

---

### CORRESPONDENCE

#### *Titus Andronicus* AND SHAKESPEARE DOGMATICS

I wish to record a protest against both the tone and the method of Professor Brooke's paper (*MLN*, xxxiv, 32 ff.), in which he discusses the views of Professor H. D. Gray on the authorship of *Titus Andronicus*. It is one thing to dissent from an argument, disposing of the evidence offered as one best can, and quite another to garble it, as I believe Mr. Brooke (doubtless unintentionally) has done; but to go still further, and cavalierly request the writer from whom one dissents to keep off the field of criticism in which he has been working, because one pleases to consider his work superfluous and has been irked by the necessity of reading it, will be admitted to be unusual.

Mr. Gray is fully competent to defend his own position, and I myself hold no brief for the special thesis of his paper on *Titus Andronicus*; but since the subject is of no little interest, since the paper was published in a rather inconspicuous collection, and since I feel certain that I have read it more carefully than Mr. Brooke, I shall venture to state the nature of the argument in very few words. Mr. Gray's view that the play was written first by Shakespeare and revised by other dramatists he supports by considerations which may be conveniently reduced to these five:

1. The external evidence in favor of Shakespeare's authorship of the tragedy is weighty.
2. The subject and treatment of the tragedy are not impossible for Shakespeare, as a number of critics have urged.
3. The main portion of the tragedy may be in Shakespeare's language and verse, as opposed to Robertson's claim for specific proof of the language and meter of other dramatists.
4. The passages most likely to be viewed as non-Shakespearean are of such a dramatic character as to suggest that they are additions rather than parts of the original composition.
5. It is *a priori* more likely that the work of a young dramatist

should be revised by others than that he should revise the work of others.

All these reasons were clearly set forth,—I do not say convincingly, because that would be to enter into the merits of the evidence, and I admit that the last of the five (which in Mr. Gray's own order comes first) was treated with undue brevity, and deserves serious discussion. But I submit that there is nothing gratuitously frivolous or inconsequent in the process of argument, and further that no reader of Mr. Brooke's account of it would have any realization of its true character. He treats Mr. Gray's discussion of points 1 and 3 as irrelevant, because they do not prove the "peculiar contention that Shakespeare was the original author," apparently forgetting that the title of the paper was "The Authorship of *Titus Andronicus*," and that the writer was in honor bound to devote a considerable proportion of his argument to the claims of critics holding the Shakespearean authorship impossible,—especially in view of the somewhat formidable case of Robertson. And to point 4, doubtless the most interesting and significant of all from the standpoint of method in dramatic analysis, he vouchsafes no attention whatever. The discussion of it occupies the ninth to the twelfth pages, inclusive, of the paper of thirteen pages; yet Mr. Brooke suffered from an extraordinary inability to find "any effort after the second page to come to grips" with the main question.

No doubt we all sympathize with Mr. Brooke in his sense of weariness over the extent of Shakespeare criticism, and on this account should pardon the inadequate attention he gave to the paper under discussion. But I cannot feel that the result is a happy augury of his apparent intention to issue from New Haven a kind of *index expurgatorius* in the field to which he has made so many useful contributions. I also have passed "through many a dark and dreary vale" where dwell the eccentric and dogmatic Shakespeare theorists, and can testify, with such slight authority as the experience may give me, that the papers of Mr. Gray are not of that territory. Any reader who may have occasion to acquaint himself with the entire group of them, which Mr. Brooke magisterially condemns in the sweep of one final proofless dictum, will perhaps not be convinced of a single one of the new hypotheses which they set forth; but he may rest assured that he will find in each case a useful account of the problem and its literature, a stimulating application of fresh methods of critical analysis, and (strangest of all) a soundly modest attitude toward the writer's contentions and a corresponding courtesy toward other hunters in the same preserve.

It may be proper for me to add that, since Mr. Gray is a friend and colleague, I do not profess to be wholly without prejudice in the matter, but that I write this communication entirely without his knowledge.

RAYMOND MACDONALD ALDEN.

Stanford University.

*Titus Andronicus*

I am distressed that Professor Gray finds my treatment of his paper unfriendly and unfair. The justice of his displeasure must be decided by those who will read the article in the Flügel Memorial Volume in connection with what I say of it. In the meantime I am sure that Mr. Gray will bear me witness that no possible basis for personal animosity has hitherto existed between us and that I have not been prone heretofore to unworthy depreciation of fellow students.

I am warned that any observations upon Mr. Gray's rejoinder must be brief. Three may suffice.

1. It hardly seems incorrect to speak of Jonson as living in days of servitude so long as he continued to do hack work for Henslowe, *i. e.*, till after June 22, 1602, when the last additions for *Jeronimo* were paid for. This was four and a half years after the date of his first appearance in the *Diary*. Mr. Gray would probably argue that Jonson was commissioned by the manager of the Fortune to write these additions because of the fame of his recent plays at the Globe and Blackfriars. Is it not more likely that he received orders for them, as for similar patchwork executed before he had any literary reputation, because he had a practical knowledge of what Henslowe's company required, and specifically because he had acted in the play in question (cf. Dekker's *Satiromastix*, Penniman's *ed.*, I. ii. 433 ff., IV. i. 161 ff.)? And when Shakespeare began revising plays, was it not because he possessed qualifications of just this sort?

2. My sentence, "No mention is made of the early editions or notices in Henslowe and the *Stationers' Register*," etc., should not be quoted without that which precedes and limits it. I disclaim heartily any intention to suggest that Mr. Gray is ignorant of the data regarding *Titus Andronicus*, but must persist in the assertion that he presents them to his readers with misleading incompleteness. The fact that he alludes to the Henslowe records on page 122 and in a note on page 123, in connection with his discussion of the German *Titus*, has little apparent relevance to the fact that on pages 114 and 115, when arguing for Shakespeare's authorship of the extant English play, he ignores, as I have said, all external evidence except that of the Folio editors and of Meres.

3. It is quite true that my note makes no original contribution to the subject of *Titus Andronicus*, and that I do not particularly indicate how the material left undiscussed by Mr. Gray seems to me adverse to his thesis. I did not desire to confuse the issue by intrusion of speculative opinions of my own. The very sentence in Mr. Gray's footnote on page 123, which he quotes in his reply, illustrates what I meant: "That *Titus Andronicus* was acted by Pembroke's men is an argument against Shakespeare's having

*revised* the piece, rather than against his original authorship of it." This looks to me like a Parthian attempt to outflank one of the pieces of positive evidence from "the early editions or notices in Henslowe and the *Stationers' Register*," which must be squarely faced and debated, I think, before one is privileged to venture a hypothesis about the play's origin. I do not understand Mr. Gray when he seems to suggest in his reply that this evidence can only be put to the use that Fuller makes of it, and that refutation of Fuller exonerates a critic from the duty of attempting a constructive interpretation of his own.

TUCKER BROOKE.

*Yale University.*

---

POSTSCRIPT

I appreciate the more courteous tone of Mr. Brooke's reply. I do not in the least accuse him of any personal or unworthy motives in his attack upon me. On his letter above I offer the following brief notes.

(1) The point is simply that Jonson was not an untried nor even an obscure writer when he was employed to produce additions to the *Spanish Tragedy*. (2) There are other methods of considering a question of authorship besides that of reexamining the familiar data, and the obligation upon one who is approaching the problem from a different angle is simply that he must not run counter to those data. (3) A play which Shakespeare *revised* would presumably be acted by the company with which he was associated; whereas a play which he had originally written, if taken over by another company, would naturally be revised by the authors who worked for that company. Perhaps my note did not state this with sufficient clearness. To Mr. Brooke's concluding sentence I answer that I did not say "can only be put" but "have been put to."

H. D. GRAY.

*Stanford University.*

---

*Piers Plowman* IN ART

In a recent article<sup>1</sup> entitled "Piers Plowman in English Wall-Paintings," Mr. E. W. Tristram advances the theory that certain representations of the crucified Christ preserved on the walls of English country churches have been inspired by the teachings set forth in *The Vision of Piers Plowman*. In these wall-paintings, badly mutilated in most cases, the figure is "surrounded by many tools of labour, arranged so as to form a halo or glory." "Clearly," he continues, "the painter has wished to convey the idea of the

<sup>1</sup> Printed in *The Burlington Magazine*, xxxi (October, 1917), 135 ff.

analogy of Christ's suffering and crucifixion to the life of the labourer," and this idea, the writer asserts, was suggested by *Piers Plowman*.<sup>2</sup> He notes in support of his theory that in the poem Christ appears in the person of Piers Plowman, "a labourer working and suffering amongst his fellows," and that the poem preaches salvation through labour. As existing manuscripts of the poem are of a poor type, written evidently for the humble reader, so the paintings in question are "paintings of the poor and not of the rich" both in theme and in execution. They are witnesses, the writer suggests, in favor of the supposition that the ideas set forth in *Piers Plowman* had the sympathy of the poorer clergy.

One may grant individual points in the writer's theory, but to the theory as a whole there are damaging objections. It is true that *Piers Plowman* preaches salvation by labor and in its opening sections exalts the figure of Piers, the common laborer in the fields. It is true, also, that Piers and Christ are identified in the later part of the poem. The writer quotes in support of this point the passage telling of the jousting of Jesus in the arms of Piers.<sup>3</sup> But in this part of the poem Piers no longer represents the simple laborer. He is, rather, all mankind; his arms which Christ puts on are *humana natura*. The figure involved in this representation of the crucifixion is not that of Christ, or Piers, the laboring man, surrounded by the tools of his daily toil, but Christ the knight, arrayed in *helm* and *haberion*, riding to meet the challenge of Satan in knightly tournament. However much emphasis the poem puts on labor as the means of salvation, there is no such identification of Christ and the laborer, no such connection between the toil of the laborer and the sufferings of Christ on the cross as the theory under discussion seems to demand. The suggestion for a crucified Christ surrounded by a halo of laborer's tools is not to be found in the text itself of *Piers Plowman*, and one may question if evidence for such a treatment of the subject could be read into the text.

How then is one to explain this peculiar halo? The most satisfactory answer is this: that these objects are not tools of labor, but the well-known instruments of the passion. The delapidated condition of the paintings makes perfect identification of all the objects impossible, but several are distinct enough to leave little doubt as to their true nature. In the wall-painting at Ampney S. Mary Church, Gloucestershire, Mr. Tristram finds the following objects:<sup>4</sup> mallet, wheel, hammer, knife, comb, dish, axe, horn, saddle, ball of cord, pincers. Not all of these objects belong with the instruments of the passion. Perhaps in some cases the identification is to be

<sup>2</sup> The paintings "are all later than the first version of the poem, and are clearly directly inspired by it" (p. 136).

<sup>3</sup> P. 135. The passage is quoted from Passus XXI, 20 f., C version. In P. XXII, 6 f., C version, is another passage where Piers, "peynted al bloody," and with a cross, is described as "like in alle lymes to oure lord Iesu," (Skeat, *Piers the Plowman*, Oxford, 1886, I, p. 551).

<sup>4</sup> P. 136. A photograph and drawing of the painting are given.



questioned. But several of them, such as the mallet, hammer, knife, dish, and pincers, clearly belong in that list. In another painting, that at Stedham, Sussex, one can recognize the vessel containing vinegar, several rod-like objects which are, probably, the reeds and staves, a knife, and, possibly, a scourge.<sup>5</sup> The correctness of this interpretation of the objects in question is confirmed by comparing these wall-paintings with the illustrations accompanying a series of prayers on the symbols of the passion in two fifteenth century MSS., reproduced in *Legends of the Holy Rood*.<sup>6</sup> Here the text leaves no doubt as to the object illustrated in the drawing. One notes a certain similarity between some of these illustrations and some of the objects distinguishable in the wall-paintings; for instance, in the case of the vessel of vinegar and the scourge in the Stedham painting.

One need scarcely argue that the instruments of the passion would find a fitting and natural place in representations of the crucifixion. They symbolized each incident in the suffering, and in themselves they summed up the whole story of the passion, as the prayers just mentioned show. Their significance would be at once apparent to the congregation, so much so, one would think, that the attempt to introduce these familiar objects with a new interpretation, as symbols of Christ the laborer, must have been lost upon those acquainted with the accepted symbolism. Some more strikingly different symbolism would have to be employed. It is more reasonable to interpret the paintings in question as orthodox representations of the crucifixion, showing Christ surrounded by the instruments of His passion. With this simpler and more plausible explanation at hand, one must put aside the perhaps more attractive theory that the decorator of these country churches was illustrating in his crude way Piers Plowman's doctrine of the divinity of labor.

CHARLOTTE D'EVELYN.

Mount Holyoke College.

---

#### LONGAEVUS ERROR TYPOGRAPHICUS

In *Mod. Lang. Notes* for June, 1918, Professor W. P. Mustard gives some very interesting sources and parallels for many phrases in Lyly's *Euphues*.

On page 336 of the *Notes*, apropos "The old verse, 'That Galen giveth goods, Justinian honours,'" Professor Mustard cites a stanza in the *Anatomy of Melancholy* (I, 2. 3. 15) and says: "Burton quotes it from 'Buchanan. eleg. lib.,' but his reference seems to be wrong." Wrong Burton undoubtedly is, if he must be held respon-

<sup>5</sup>At one side of the figure is a pair of scales, not, as far as I know, usually included with the instruments of the passion.

<sup>6</sup>*E. E. T. S.*, 46, p. 170 f.

sible for an error made by his printer. But something should be said in defence of an author whose original copy was not at fault.

A comparison of the early editions of Burton reveals a curious fact. In all the editions will be found the verses:

Dat Galenus opes, dat Justinianus honores,  
Sed genus et species cogitur ire pedes.

Beginning with the second edition (1624), there is added, a few lines below this quotation, another stanza which reads as follows:

Calliope longum caelebs cur vixit in aevum?  
Nempe nihil dotis quod numeraret, erat.

In both second and third (1628) editions, a star prefixed to this stanza cites correctly the marginal reference, "Buchanan. eleg. lib." This may be verified by consulting vv. 101-102 of Buchanan's first Elegy, entitled "Quam misera sit conditio docentium literas humaniores Lutetiae," an elegy that comported well with Burton's mood when he was writing his chapter, "Love of Learning. With a Digression of the misery of Schollers, and why the Muses are Melancholy." Cf. Ruddimann's edition of Buchanan, II, 304, Leyden, 1725.

In the fourth edition of Burton, published in 1632 during his own life-time, by an error the star has been shifted to the Galenus stanza; and every succeeding edition has retained it there. This is certainly extraordinary when we reflect that the Anatomy has been printed about a score of times. We trust that Professor Bensley in his fourthcoming edition will set this little matter aright. In the first edition (1621) of Burton, the Calliope stanza is lacking; and the Galenus stanza is quoted in the first, second, and third editions without reference to its source.

*University of Missouri.*

G. C. SCOGGIN.

---

#### BRIEF MENTION

*The English Ode to 1660: An Essay in Literary History.* By Robert Shafer (Princeton University Press, 1918). To define the English ode as a *genre* and then to trace its history during a definite period is the task undertaken by the author of this Doctoral Dissertation. The literary 'kinds' are for the most part easily defined with sufficient precision to keep history and criticism running true to underlying principles and to the tradition of conventionalities. This statement does not include the English ode. The generic meaning of the word 'ode' has led to its use as a designation of poems so varied in form and character as to deprive it, in the general mind, of the exclusive connotations of a specific art-form; and yet this art-form as a definable 'kind' has a conspicuous place in the history of English poetry. That, at least, is Dr. Shafer's assumption, and he makes a laudable attempt to reason out the required workable definition.

The suggested definition of what is properly to be classed as an English ode is found to be applicable to no composition earlier than two odes by John Soothern, published in 1584; and Cowley, by his odes, determines the lower limit of the period minutely surveyed by Dr. Shafer. From this the inference issues at once that a basal element in the typical English ode is Pindaric. It follows that the form, content, style, purpose, and cultural significance of the odes of Pindar must be kept in mind as a preparation to apprehend Pindarism when moulded into conformity with English nationality and literary art. Another basal element in this construction of a definition is Horatian, the evaluation of which requires in its turn an examination of the odes of Horace. A chapter on "Classical Prototypes" accordingly follows the preliminary statement "that the English ode has been in its origins very largely influenced by the examples of Pindar and Horace."

The English ode is a delayed product of the Renaissance, beginning with direct translation (or rather with a translation of an imitation) and gradually emerging as a nationalized form thru the observance of the true doctrine of imitation, or the right appropriation of a *genre*, which put it into the category of original compositions. In what manner could the Pindaric ode, a species of composition so peculiarly Greek, be made to yield to this process of 'imitation'? The answer to this question is to be elicited from a sufficiently minute and sympathetic discrimination of the elements of the Greek form, which Dr. Shafer supplies in a well-constructed section of his treatise (pp. 10-25). He then answers the question in a subjoined section, entitled "The 'Ideal' English Pindaric Ode." It is assumed to be "possible to formulate a series of fairly definite criteria for the Pindaric ode in English" (p. 26); and "on the basis of such criteria we can have no very great difficulty in distinguishing the true from the false amongst those English odes for which their writers claim Pindaric quality" (p. 29). The specific association of the Greek games must become generalized, so that "in English, any subject of social or public—as opposed to private—importance, which possesses associations of a distinctively emotional sort, would be appropriate for a Pindaric ode." The poet must view his subject objectively and yet handle it with glowing enthusiasm and in "lyrical form." The formal dignity of the poem is to be sustained by observance of Pindar's demonstrated precept, that there must be "a distinguishable beginning, middle, and end." In accordance with the inner value of the tradition, therefore, "The beginning would concern itself with some indication of the poem's subject-matter, the middle would treat of one or more of the natural associations of this subject in such a way as to induce in the reader an appropriate emotion, and the end or conclusion of the poem would refer the reader back once more to the immediate subject in hand, thus giving direction and

clear meaning to the emotional state induced in him." In poetic style Pindar sets a high pattern, an example that baffles mediocrity. The English poet, without the adventitious, or rather organic, aid of "instrumental music and the dance," by which the Greek poet's rhythms and lyrical effects were heightened, has all the more need, in writing for the reader, to strive to attain the supreme qualities of "a rapid and compressed style, predominantly allusive in character." In doing this he can hardly fail to follow Pindar in the method of achieving emotional unity and kindling "lyrical fervour" without monotony by exercising artistic skill in variety and brevity and in the use of certain stylistic devices, such as that of "recurrent words." The English Pindaric ode is to be effective in sustaining 'lyrical enthusiasm' by an appropriate conformity to national versification, not by an attempted imitation of Greek meters; but it may be expected to be written in triads, for the external relation of the triad to the chorus was of less significance than the function of this design as a stanzaic or structural unit, which was a support both to the majestic movement of the poem, and to the maintenance of its lyrical quality without monotony thru a succession of these units.

The Renaissance theory of the imitation of so organic a product of Greek social and national life as the Pindaric ode would require the English ode with Pindaric elements to have a corresponding relation to the character of the English mind. On the other hand, the derivative Horatian ode, artistically exclusive and not intimately representing popular impulses, must inevitably transmit a relatively cold and unimaginative artificiality and a spirit of studied restraint of feeling with pride in intellectual niceties, all at the cost of characteristics that foster the enthusiasms of the national mind. Dr. Shafer discusses the character of the odes of Horace, and attempts "the formulation of criteria for the English ode."

It is shown "that before the close of the sixteenth century practically no poem [the word 'practically' makes allowance for John Soothern's performance] had been printed which we can justly call an ode" (p. 55). This is the conclusion deduced from a survey of English poetry that reaches back to the *Battle of Brunanburh* and the *Poema Morale*, to which critics of later times have occasionally attached the designation 'ode.' This survey is not without points of special interest. How the name 'ode' came to be applied to a division of Wyatt's poems is at last conclusively reported. Then, Thomas Watson is found to be the first English author to entitle a poem an ode (1582), tho it is a poem that does not altogether satisfy the requirements of the *genre*; he was, besides, still freer in the use of the name thruout his explanatory notes. At the heels of Watson are John Soothern's two odes in his *Pandora* (1584) translated from Ronsard, in which, for the first time in English, the Pindaric triad is represented in the naming of the divisions of the odes; and the vaunt was expressed "that never man before/

Now in England, Knewe Pindar's String." It is well known that this was a fraudulent boast, for the poetaster (the epithet usually and justly bestowed on Soothern) merely transferred the personal boast of Ronsard from France to England, and was totally devoid of any immediate knowledge of Pindar. In these odes Soothern, by not following Ronsard in keeping strophe and antistrophe alike in structure and different from the epode, divested these traditional designations of structural meaning. Finally, this survey embraces an examination of the so-called odes of Shakespeare, Greene, and Barnfield, and the sonnet-sequences of the last decade of the sixteenth century; but altho many poems are here called odes, no true ode is discovered. The wretched performance of Soothern is thus to this point of time left undisturbed in its uniqueness.

That Soothern should be the first in England to bring Pindar's name into association with an art-form is all the more surprising when the knowledge of Pindar on the continent is traced onwards from the *editio princeps*, Venice, 1513. Trissino in 1515 and 1520 published the earliest Italian odes representing a conscious imitation of the triad-form. Following him closely in time, Alamanni advanced from this merely formal imitation to an attempt "to catch certain of Pindar's characteristics, such as his brevity and variety, his allusive style, and even his occasional obscurity" (p. 63). Ronsard, who is next considered, may perhaps have been influenced by the example of Alamanni; at all events, he too, writing in triads, attempted, but with only a measure of success, an approach to the notable characteristics of Pindar's style. Ronsard's boast has already been noticed. Finally, passing Minturno by, for his Pindaric odes "add nothing to the earlier achievement of Alamanni," Chiabrera is called up. He founded "the 'Pindaric school' of seventeenth century Italian poetry," but his odes are feeble in spirit and commonplace in thought. This persistent imitation of Pindar on the continent elicits the question whether Pindar was wholly unknown in England before Soothern announced him. The question leads Dr. Shafer to give an indication of the unimportant character of the attention bestowed on Pindar in the English universities and schools, and to show that no real knowledge of the poet underlies the references to him indulged in by the Elizabethan critics. Nothing is discovered here that lessens the appropriateness of entitling the next chapter "The Real Beginnings of the Species."

The beginning, "a timid and partial, but still appreciable" beginning of the English ode as a 'kind' is recognized by Dr. Shafer in the odes of Davison's *Poetical Rhapsody*. This judgment must not, in fairness, be construed to mean more than has been meant. It is supported by the peculiarity of metrical forms and the exclusive designation 'ode'; but it lacks all support of content. That there was now begun a tendency to give to 'ode' a specific meaning is the inference drawn from the *Rhapsody*. This is con-



firmed by Drayton's direct discussion of the matter in his prefatory note *To the Reader*. Drayton would give to 'ode' "a definiteness of meaning which it had not earlier enjoyed, merely by connecting it closely with the work of Pindar and Horace" (p. 84), and in his odes he advanced the proper conception of the English *genre*. Familiar with the efforts of Soothern, he did not, however, attempt the Pindaric form, but held more to Horace. His view of national equivalence also led him to admit the influence of the popular ballad. In metrical form he owes much to Skelton and much also to Ronsard, and there is a debt of theme and content to Ronsard and other French poets. Passing on to Milton, only the *Nativity Ode* is registered, but with notable distinction, for "here almost at a single bound the English ode springs into full-blown life." Dr. Shafer decides that this ode, on analysis, responds to the test of content and emotional unity.

Dr. Shafer holds confidently to a prescribed course in his elimination, on every hand, of so-called odes from the type he is laboring to rescue from confused tradition. He avoids ambiguities of definition with a virile directness and with an avoidance of "tall and opaque words" that will make the verification of his conclusions a simple and instructive procedure. Leaving Milton with no following in this species, he turns to Jonson, with whose followers the cultivation of the true ode would not unnaturally be looked for. In his translations from Horace, Jonson succeeded in each case in conveying "some idea of the Latin form," but in a small group of original poems, "of unequal excellence" however, he accomplished that which "had been only imperfectly foreshadowed by his contemporary and friend, Drayton"; he wrote "with a consciousness that the ode constitutes a distinct 'kind' or species of lyric." The address or apostrophe is raised in content and treatment to a higher level than that of personal significance, tho "the emotional level in these poems is not very high." Jonson was here in closest alliance with Horace, but he also studied Pindar, whose "exalted lyrical enthusiasm," however, was beyond his reach. Several poems show Pindaric influence in stanzaic structure; this external influence culminated in the well-known ode in four triads, with disputed relation to the "very soul" of Pindar; Dr. Shafer pronounces it "an ode which is Pindaric in spirit as well as in form" . . . and "of enduring worth and charm."

A survey of Jonson's immediate successors brings to light, as might not be expected, "very little" that is "contributory to the development of the true ode." With these poets,—Randolph, D'Avenant, Herrick, Hall, Lovelace, and Marvell are reviewed,—the "general tendency was away from the direction of the true ode and towards a species of light, though polished, lyric in which only two real features of the ode were present—its character of an address, or apostrophe, and its lyrical and prevailingly complex verse-form" (p. 122). The only admitted exception to this state-

ment is the recognition of Marvell's *Horatian Ode upon Cromwell's Return from Ireland*, for this "conforms in all essentials to the requirements we have laid down for the ode."

The lower chronological limit of this investigation is reached in the *Pindaric Odes* (1656) of Cowley, who "made the ode a fashionable and conspicuous species of poetry, . . . and this served permanently to fix it in the national consciousness as a recognisable and distinct 'kind' of lyric (p. 157). In the discussion summed up in this manner, the major number of pages relate to the metrical structure of Cowley's odes. This may at first dispose the reader to accuse Dr. Shafer of "travelling out of the record"; but the results of the amplified pages are important. The error in holding Cowley to be the inventor or an innovator in the use of "free or irregular verse" is corrected by a survey of the practice of poets preceding Cowley; the relation, in this matter, of Cowley to Crashaw is put in clearer light; and Cowley's adoption of a well established metrical tradition is shown to be justified by the poet's conception of a requirement of the true, nationalized ode. In Cowley's "Preface" the matter is made plain, that the triad-form was rejected not mistakingly or in ignorance, but in accordance with the poet's judgment of a native substitute for the foreign form. Cowley's 'irregular verse' was adopted as "an additional means of achieving, in English," Pindaric effects. The external form of the English ode was thus established, and 'irregularity' raised to the dignity of a fixed canon. No less conscious of what he was attempting to do was Cowley with reference to the spirit and manner of Pindar. The "enthusiastic manner" of his prototype was, however, beyond his reach; and temperamentally more like Horace (but falling below him in technique of workmanship), Cowley "caught really nothing of Pindar's spirit" (p. 155). Lacking the "emotional and poetic endowment" for true imitation, Cowley at times committed puerilities of false imitation; on the other hand, "many of Cowley's odes do have, indeed, an undeniable dignity and broadness of sweep that is genuinely impressive,"—"the excellencies of these odes are," however, "other than Pindaric." The credit, however, of permanently fixing "in the national consciousness" the type of the English ode remains Cowley's.

What has here been sketched should show that this dissertation is of real importance. The author has laid a foundation for the discriminating study of the English ode thru its complete history.

J. W. B.

---

It is with pleasure that we greet the publication in this country of a complete work devoted to the study of a single modern French author, and we hope that the series may be continued, as it will supply a want keenly felt by every teacher of French literature in the United States.

Professor Ray P. Bowen in his *Life and Novels of Ferdinand Fabre* (Studies in Literature, R. G. Badger, Boston, 1918) has chosen as subject an exceedingly interesting man as well as a writer of high rank, and his sympathetic study brings this fact clearly to our attention. Where else among the French writers of the nineteenth century do we find a devout Christian, refusing to take orders, not because of conscientious doubt or of dislike for the institutions of the church, but because he is so straightforward and clean that he cannot reconcile his natural instincts and his priestly vows, and refuses to treat the latter as other than sacred?

Professor Bowen brings out clearly the development of Fabre's mind and of his talent. He follows him through his early life with his uncle, the Abbé Fulcran, in the Cévenol Mountains, through his course at the Seminary, through his years of trial at Paris. He shows us when and how Fabre discovered his talent and the limitations of his field. We learn with him that Fabre had two objects to express, both of which he knew at first hand, peasant life of the Cévenols, the inner side of lesser ecclesiastic life. Professor Bowen also essays a classification of Fabre's works, but in this he is less happy. He divides the novels by periods, then by subject matter; the classification is not incorrect, but is hardly worth while. Practically all of Fabre's novels draw from the two fields with which he was familiar, and neither field excludes the other; simply in some cases one side will be more prominent, in other cases the other.

Taken as a whole the little book is a valuable and helpful guide to the study of Fabre's life and works and will be found useful. It is regrettable that numerous misprints and poor spacing mar its otherwise attractive appearance.

M. P. B.

---

Professor Marcel Moraud brought out a most timely little book last summer when he prepared *Sous Les Armes* (Henry Holt & Co., 1918) for use at the beginning of the school year. After the hasty compositions of 1917-18, for use in training camps and with prospective workers in France, it was a pleasant surprise to have a war-book which was clear, readable, and yet timely. Furthermore, the ending of hostilities has not yet ended the usefulness of *Sous Les Armes*. The selections are well made, the stories are of lasting interest, and the vocabulary is not slang but filled with the current expressions that the war has put on everyone's lips.

The names of Anatole France, Pierre Loti, Maurice Barrès, and Henry Bordeaux in the table of authors indicate sufficiently that the collection is something more than a file of newspaper clippings. Teachers will find the book excellent for translation and for oral work in class. The notes are well done and there is a full vocabulary, revised already since the first appearance of the text.

M. P. B.